Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-213
Monday
4 November 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-213 *4 November 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NOTICE TO READERS: The United States Government recognizes the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Arms Control & Disarmament

Observer Comments on National Nuclear Control *[TASS]* 1
U.S. Thinking on Arms Reductions Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Oct]* 1

Worldwide Issues

Further Reportage on Madrid Conference 2
Pankin Opens Peace Conference *[PRAVDA 1 Nov]* 2
Pankin Addresses Talks *[TASS]* 4
Pankin, Baker Give News Conference *[TASS]* 5
Egyptian Envoy Views Soviet Role *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]* 5
Conference Demonstrates 'Realism' *[TASS]* 6
Palestinian Envoy on Israeli Role *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 Oct]* 6
Propaganda, Recriminations Reported *[IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]* 8
PRAVDA Assesses Progress *[2 Nov]* 9
Pogodin Comments on Results *[Moscow International]* 11
Program Reviews International Role, Events *[Moscow Radio]* 11
IZVESTIYA on G-7 Delegation's Visit *[26 Oct]* 16

United States & Canada

Navy Chief's Visit to U.S. Reported *[INTERFAX]* 17
U.S. Defense Official on Roundtable Talks *[Radio Rossii]* 17
Soviet-U.S. University Opens in Moscow *[TASS]* 18

China

PRC President's Views on Relations Noted *[Moscow International]* 18
Growing Economic Ties With Taiwan Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 18

Northeast Asia

Japanese Envoy Discusses Territorial Issue *[Moscow TV]* 19
Japanese Ruling on Kuril Visits Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]* 20
ROK-U.S. Military Exercise Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 21
Trade, Cooperation With ROK Increasing *[TASS]* 22
'Progress' Noted in Inter-Korean Talks *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 22
Expedition Resumes Filming of KAL Site *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 22

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Opposition Visit to Moscow Postponed *[INTERFAX]* 23
Afghanistan Signs Economic, Trade Protocol *[TASS]* 24
Iran's Nuclear Potential, PRC Ties Eyed *[Moscow International]* 24
Commentary on Middle East Role, Policies *[Moscow International]* 24

West Europe

German Bank Official Visits, Views Economy 25
Meets Gorbachev *[TASS]* 25
Sums Up Talks *[TASS]* 26
Bank To Open Kiev Branch *[INTERFAX]* 26
Meets Silayev, Notes Debt *[Radio Rossii]* 26
Silayev, Germany's Moellemann on Economic Ties *[TASS]* 27
Germany Still Seeks Honecker Extradition *[TASS]* 27
German Magazine 'Financed by KGB' for Years *[Moscow TV]* 27
General Grachev Ends Visit to Norway *[TASS]* 27
Group Continues Wallenberg Investigation *[INTERFAX]* 28
France Grants Fr1.6 Billion in Food Credit *[Radio Rossii]* 28

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro Praises Soviet People at Havana Fair *[TASS]* 28
Cuban Nuclear Power Experts To Train in USSR *[Radio Rossii]* 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Session Held on 1 Nov; Official Comments *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Military Amnesty Law Adopted *[TASS]* 30
IZVESTIYA Calls Supreme Soviet 'Uneven' *[1 Nov]* 30
Soviet of Union Meeting Begins on 4 Nov *[TASS]* 31

Political & Social

Gorbachev Addresses State Council 4 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Remarks on Western Aid *[TASS]* 34
Government Heads of Economic Community Meet 34
Ministries To Cease Legal Existence *[TASS]* 34
Further on Proceedings *[INTERFAX]* 34
Kebich Remarks on Functions *[Moscow TV]* 35
Future of TASS Considered *[TASS]* 35
Council To Consider Fate of Foreign Ministry *[INTERFAX]* 35
Pankin Remarks on Yeltsin Proposal *[Moscow TV]* 36
Internal Affairs Ministries on Reorganization *[Moscow TV]* 36
Trade Unions Question Yeltsin Economic Policy *[TASS]* 37
Confederation of Trade Unions Congress Opens *[Radio Rossii]* 37
CPSU Financial Scandals May Affect Treaties *[INTERFAX]* 37
Prosecutor General, Lawyers on Coup Case *[TASS]* 37
Documents Reveal Nuclear Waste Dumping *[Moscow TV]* 38
Poll on Autonomous Republics in RSFSR Taken *[INTERFAX]* 38
TASS Carries Press Reviews 39
1 Nov 39
2 Nov 40

Military

Radiation Accident at Submarine Facility *[INTERFAX]* 41
Military Units To Remain in Baltic Territory *[TASS]* 41
Shaposhnikov on Ukraine Nuclear, Army Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Air Defense Head on Professional Armed Forces *[Russian TV]* 41
Navy Command To Improve Working Conditions *[KRASNAYAYA ZVEZDA 31 Oct]* 42
Military Movement Requests Army Reform *[INTERFAX]* 42
Defense Ministry To Reform Call-Up System *[TASS]* 42

BALTIC COUNTRIES

Baltic Affairs

Conditions for Soviet Troop Withdrawal Cited *[Radio Vilnius]* 43

Estonia

Withdrawal of Soviet Troops To Begin 3 Nov *[TASS]* 43
Minister on Decline in USSR, Russian Imports *[Tallinn Radio]* 43
Communist Leader Says Party Not To Disband *[Tallinn Radio]* 43
Official Views Relay of Central Television *[Tallinn Radio]* 43

Latvia

U.S. To Provide Grain in 'Near Future' *[Radio Rossii]* 44
Official Denies Reports of Trade War With RSFSR *[Riga International]* 44
Registration of Most Immigrants Suspended 29 Oct *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Oct]* 44
Immigration Draft Bill Approved 2 Nov *[BALTFAX]* 44
Organization Protests Decree on Citizenship *[BALTFAX]* 44
'Informers' Recruited in Possible 'Witchhunt' *[BALTFAX]* 45
Bartering for Gasoline Supplies Noted *[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]* 45

Lithuania

Immediate Withdrawal of Soviet Forces Demanded *[TASS]* 45
Landsbergis on Date for Talks With USSR *[TASS]* 46
Republic Oil, Gas Reportedly in Short Supply *[Vilnius International]* 46
Ministry Refutes Press Reports on Unemployment *[Radio Vilnius]* 47
Belorussia's Shushkevich Gives Vilnius Speech *[Radio Vilnius]* 47
Labor Party Denounces 'Harsh Treatment' *[Vilnius International]* 49
Customs Protocol Signed With Poland *[Radio Vilnius]* 49

RSFSR

Fifth Congress of People's Deputies

Wrap-Up of 1 Nov Congress Proceedings Reported *[Russian TV]* 50
2 Nov Proceedings *[Russian TV]* 51
Khasbulatov News Conference on Congress *[Russian TV]* 51
Deputies Question Gorbachev's Credit Request *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Nov]* 53
Deputies Pass Law on Constitutional Changes *[INTERFAX]* 54
Georgia Urged To Resolve Ossetia Conflict *[TASS]* 54
Resolution on Sanctions Passed *[INTERFAX]* 54
Draft on Reorganizing Executive Rule Passed *[INTERFAX]* 55
Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairmen Elected *[TASS]* 55
Draft Decision on Socioeconomic Situation Noted *[Russian TV]* 55
Bank Chairman Comments on Withdrawing Banknotes *[TASS]* 56
'Text' of Yeltsin Report on Draft Constitution *[TASS]* 56
Views 'Divided' on Yeltsin Address *[Radio Rossii]* 59
Emergence of 'Constructive Opposition' Viewed *[TASS]* 60
Zorkin Elected Constitutional Court Chairman *[Radio Rossii]* 60
'Russia' Faction Calls for Talks With Baltics *[BALTFAX]* 61
Deputies Pass Bills on Territorial Integrity *[INTERFAX]* 61
Khasbulatov Delivers Closing Speech to Congress *[Russian TV]* 61
Further on Congress Conclusion *[TASS]* 63

Federation Affairs

Future of USSR Foreign Ministry Discussed *[INTERFAX]* 63
Foreign Minister Comments *[TASS]* 64
Further on Kozyrev Remarks *[Moscow TV]* 64

More Reaction to, Support for Yeltsin Reforms 64
Editorial on Price Liberalization *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 64
Volskiy, Medvedev Comment *[Radio Rossii]* 65
Liberal Party Chairman Reacts *[TASS]* 65
Deputies on 'Social Explosions' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Nov]* 66
Russian Parties Back Yeltsin *[TASS]* 66
'Political Bloc' Formed *[TASS]* 66
Filshin 'Fully Supports' Yeltsin *[Radio Rossii]* 67
Rutskoy, Others React *[Moscow Radio]* 67
'Radical' Economic Reforms Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 67
Economist on Yeltsin Plan *[Radio Rossii]* 68

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

Shushkevich Reacts to Yeltsin Reform Plan *[Moscow TV]* 69
Republic Faces Economic 'Aggression' From East *[Minsk Radio]* 69
Official Rejects Failed Coup Support Reports *[TASS]* 69
Cooperation Agreement Signed With Moldova *[Minsk Radio]* 69

Moldova

Yeltsin Speech Assailed, Countermeasures Vowed *[Moscow Radio]* 69
'Militants' Demand Reunification With Romania *[Bucharest Radio]* 70
Snegur Resignation Demanded *[AFP]* 70
Army, Border Guards To Be Reorganized *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 70
Deputy Favors Signing Economic Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 70
Press Details Pre-Election Tension *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 70

Ukraine

Inter-Republic Economic Agreement To Be Signed *[INTERFAX]* 72
Economic Links With USSR Stressed *[Kiev Radio]* 72
Statement on Resolving Questions With Russia *[TASS]* 72
Kiev Rejects Russian Claims to Supremacy *[Kiev International]* 73
Russian Cooperation Talks Conclude in Kiev *[Radio Rossii]* 73
Defense Minister Stresses Nuclear-Free Republic *[Russian TV]* 73
Reaction to Republic Nuclear Claims Noted *[IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]* 73
Kravchuk Seeks Unified Strategic Forces Plus Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]* 74
Findings on 11 Oct Chernobyl Fire Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 75
Fire Breaks Out at Chernobyl Power Plant 1 Nov *[TASS]* 75
Seven Candidates Registered for President *[Kiev International]* 75
Candidate Backs Unified Strategic Forces Command *[INTERFAX]* 75
Afghan Veterans Assail 'Political Games' *[Kiev International]* 75

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

Continued Violence Reported in Nagorno-Karabakh 76
Armenians Attack Villages *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Highlights of Recent Incidents Cited *[ARMENPRES]* 76
Automatic Weapon Fire Noted *[ARMENPRES]* 76
Stepanakert Mayor Resigns *[ARMENPRES]* 76
Moscow TV Details Republic Developments 77
Defense Council Discusses Forming Armed Forces *[INTERFAX]* 77
Nakhichevan Leader Criticizes Economic Blockade *[Radio Rossii]* 77

Georgia

'Critical Point' Reached in South Ossetia *[TASS]* 77
Supreme Soviet Discusses Situation *[INTERFAX]* 78
TASS Roundup of Area 78
'Intense Firing' Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 78
Tskhinvali Guard 'Ready To Die' *[Moscow International]* 78
President Gamsakhurdia Appoints New Officials 79
Advisor on Humanitarian, Legal Issues *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 24 Oct]* 79
Agriculture Minister *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 22 Oct]* 79
Gamsakhurdia's Relations With Yeltsin Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Nov]* 79
Supreme Soviet Grants Privileges to President *[Moscow TV]* 79
Supreme Soviet Rejects Economic Treaty *[Radio Rossii]* 79

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Further Reportage of Nazarbayev Visit to UK 80
Continues Business Meetings *[TASS]* 80
Goals 'Successfully' Attained *[TASS]* 80
Visit Ends; Results Reviewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]* 81
Opposition Protests Against President 2 Nov *[INTERFAX]* 81
Defense Chief Advocates Unified Armed Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]* 82

Kyrgyzstan

President Akayev Reviews Visit to U.S. *[TASS]* 82
President Reacts to 'Realistic' Yeltsin Program *[TASS]* 83
To Meet Yeltsin 5 Nov *[Radio Rossii]* 83

Uzbekistan

People's Democratic Party Holds Congress 1 Nov *[INTERFAX]* 83
Bolshevism, Communism 'Abandoned' *[Moscow TV]* 84
Karimov Elected Head of Party *[INTERFAX]* 84
Defense Ministry Favors Unified Armed Forces *[Moscow TV]* 84
Republic Not To Help Pay Soviet Foreign Debt *[Moscow TV]* 85
Cypriot President Visits; Economic Ties Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 85

Arms Control & Disarmament

Observer Comments on National Nuclear Control

LD0111235291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1404 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Nov (TASS)—The leaders of the Western countries are by no means pleased at the prospect of the formation of numerous new states in place of the Soviet Union, some of which would have control of what are now nuclear weapons of the Union. Naturally, in this connection a consolidating role in strengthening the Union falls to the country's president. Inter alia, the results of recent meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and the leaders of the United States, Spain, and France provide completely unambiguous evidence of this.

At the news conference of the presidents of the USSR and France in Soustons, Francois Mitterrand spoke directly of his support for efforts directed toward the preservation of the Soviet Union and even its reinforcement. "The center must preserve control over the Armed Forces, and above all nuclear weapons. Questions of foreign indebtedness, aid to the Soviet Union, and the general economy should also fall within its authority ... France is not interested in the disintergration of the Soviet Union or the formation of a political vacuum on its enormous territory," the French president emphasized.

Changes in the climate of international relations over recent years have also led to a shifting of emphasis and priorities on ensuring security and stability. In particular, problems of the nonproliferaton of nuclear weapons have come to the forefront, as well as measures to avert the threat of a transfer of means of mass destruction to the control of irresponsible groups and persons. It is for this reason that the proposal of Francois Mitterrand to convene a conference of the four powers possessing nuclear weapons in Europe, in connection with the threat of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, has therefore met with a great international response. The French president considers that in connection with the present situation in the USSR "it is necessary to discuss the question of what mutual obligations we can assume so as to continue to implement strict control over nuclear weapons."

It can be imagined that under present circumstances this proposal deserves the most serious attention. It goes without saying that there must be discussion at the conference not only of the "physical security" of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and means of their delivery. Although even the question of whether the guarding of strategic weapons, let us say, on the territory of the Ukraine, will be controlled from the center or from Kiev, is of great importance to all the countries of Europe.

If a conference of the four powers actually takes place, the question of the resolute strengthening of the conditions of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons must be made the cornerstone. Even a minimal risk of the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to "new masters" is fraught with catastrophe. The security system in respect of nuclear weapons must be built on warning all potential claimants to membership of the "nuclear club" of possible sanctions, from an economic blockade to measures of a military nature. The "carrot and stick" policy which is odious in other situations ceases to be odious in the case of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It goes without saying that an enormous role in strengthening conditions of nonproliferation can be played by further cuts in the arsenals of all nuclear powers, as well as an accord on the cessation of underground nuclear tests.

U.S. Thinking on Arms Reductions Viewed

PM0411114791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 91 Single Edition p 3

[G. Kostenko article: "Sensible and Useful Opinions—USSR and U.S. Mutual Initiatives in the Sphere of Nuclear Disarmament Are Discussed"]

[Text] It is almost a month since the new U.S. and USSR initiatives in the sphere of nuclear disarmament were revealed. Throughout this time there has been a lively discussion in the U.S. Congress, in scientific and social circles, and, of course, in the U.S. media both on G. Bush and M. Gorbachev's actual statements about these initiatives and on the consequences they are bound to entail. An evaluation of the overall picture and the basic positions in this discussion is undoubtedly of great interest.

Above all it is unanimously acknowledged that there has been an appreciable change of direction in the two great powers' efforts: Today, their common task is not simply to reduce nuclear danger but to eradicate it. Given the changes taking place in the world and in Europe in particular, even such extremely conservative experts as K. Adelman, for example, are no longer relegating the achievement of this aim to the realm of fantasy. At the same time, the U.S. press highlights not just the broad coincidence of each side's position but also the differences between them on several specific questions.

The general view is that positions coincide to the greatest degree on the question of eliminating tactical nuclear weapons. Today, Washington believes that on a practical level tactical nuclear forces have lost their former significance. From a purely military viewpoint, their functions can be executed fully by the new "smart" conventional arms systems. Nevertheless, there is an insistent proposal in conservative circles to seek out an opportunity for agreeing with the Soviet Union on "certain exceptions" to the ban on ground-launched tactical nuclear systems. In this case, a "guarantee reserve" of such systems located on U.S. territory would serve for the

United States and its allies as an argument for preserving (in modified form) NATO's "flexible response" strategy.

The fact that air-launched tactical nuclear weapons are being maintained in a combat-ready state in Europe against the backdrop of the widely-publicized withdrawal and partial destruction of ground-launched and sea-launched tactical nuclear weapons has not gone unnoticed by observers. Although it follows from press reports citing a Pentagon representative that the administration has not yet dismissed the more far-reaching Soviet idea of storing this category of nuclear munitions at central storage bases.

Nevertheless, the preservation—even if only in part—of such weapons (the press gives a current figure of between 900 and 1,300 U.S. nuclear aerial bombs located at bases in European countries—Belgium, Britain, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey) is "justified" on two counts. First, these weapons may be necessary to U.S. troops in Europe as a traditional "nuclear umbrella." Second, some people believe that the complete withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from Europe would mean that Britain and France would have to become more actively committed to the process of maintaining their own nuclear arsenals.

As for the U.S.-proposed option for reducing strategic arms via a ban on MIRV'd ICBM's, many specialists evaluate this as politically lame. This option clearly ignores understandable Soviet concerns about the concentration of the bulk of U.S. nuclear warheads on ballistic missiles launched from submarines and heavy bombers. In this case, the U.S. initiative would mainly be implemented at the expense of the Soviet side's arms and in addition would create tremendous difficulties for the latter on an economic and technical level. It is recognized that the Soviet proposals in this field are deeper and broader in scope than the U.S. proposals and that their implementation would increase stability and promote radical mutual reductions in the levels of offensive weapons.

Many press organs stress that it would be in both USSR and U.S. interests to delay modernization of both sides' nuclear forces. The cuts in military expenditure being implemented in these countries have already begun to have a restraining influence on this process. Measures aimed at preventing so called "invisible modernization" through the large-scale replacement of nuclear munitions by more up-to-date missiles and aircraft would also contribute to genuine restraint in the modernization of forces. The Soviet Union's proposed moratorium on nuclear testing pursues precisely this aim.

It is recognized by literally everyone that the problem of controlling nuclear weapons and preventing their unsanctioned use has become an important aspect in the matter of limiting nuclear danger. U.S. proposals regarding cooperation in this sphere as well as in the matter of eliminating nuclear weapons open up a new and promising area in Soviet-U.S. cooperation. "We have much to talk about in the field of reducing the risk of a nuclear strike," Senator S. Nunn said. At the same time, it would be natural to formulate the question in such a way as to involve the other nuclear powers—Britain, France, China—in this cooperation.

There is widespread discussion on the problem of the pace of progress toward a nuclear-free world, which more often than not is seen as insufficient. The fact is that the anticipated destruction of 3,000 nuclear devices (basically already totally unnecessary) out of over 22,000 belonging to the United States—according to information from AP—does not constitute such a qualitative achievement.

The prospects for dialogue on joint efforts to guarantee protection against missile attack are viewed without particular optimism. Likewise, the proposal to create a nonnuclear ABM defense system based on the U.S. GPALS (Global Protection Against Limited Strike) project is evaluated in the press as far from acceptable to the Soviet side. Its implementation would require rescinding the existing ABM Treaty and developing space weapons, thus reducing the effectiveness of Soviet strategic offensive arms to a far greater extent than that of U.S. strategic offensive arms. The possibility of transferring state-of-the-art space-based ABM technology to other countries is considered unrealistic in practice.

In this connection, the view that it would be most rational to adopt a new approach to the problems of reciprocal guarantees for protection against missile attack is expressed. Here, the first step could be to define the character and parameters of possible threats to security from third countries at special consultations between Soviet and U.S. specialists. Later it would be possible to agree on consensus measures, including political, economic, and military measures, in the event of a possible attack.

There is also some degree of interest as to when the ideas—which are clearly sensible on the whole—will become elements of official Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The Madrid meeting between the USSR and U.S. Presidents is first-hand proof that such dialogue continues to widen and deepen.

Worldwide Issues

Further Reportage on Madrid Conference

Pankin Opens Peace Conference

PM0111143191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 91 p 4

[Special correspondents V. Volkov and T. Kolesnichenko report under the rubric "News from Madrid Conference": "Victory Can Only Be in Common"]

[Text] Madrid, 31 Oct—As the ancients used to say, "this is history in the making": Yesterday morning

USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin uttered a single sentence in pure Russian—"I declare the peace conference on the Near East open"—and struck the table with a gavel.

Speaking next, the conference cochairmen—G. Bush and M.S. Gorbachev—said everything that it is fitting to say on such occasions. Today the press is singling out from our president's 20-minute speech the words to the effect that it will be unforgivable if the chance for peace in the Near East region is missed this time. Bush is cited in greater detail because, holding the threads of the conference in his hands, he touched on the specifics of the upcoming talks and their strategy and tactics. From his viewpoint the strategic task is to achieve lasting peace in the region. Not just the absence of war but the creation of strong infrastructures of peace: above all, the treaty itself, economic cooperation between Israel and the Arabs, cultural exchange, and even tourism. On the tactical plane he emphasized that for the sake of achieving success at the talks compromises in territorial concessions are needed—it is impossible to do without them.

And, whereas yesterday the attention of the press was mainly fixed on the visible tip of the conference iceberg—the seating of the meeting participants (calculated almost down to the centimeters separating Shamir from the representatives of Egypt and Lebanon, seated on either side of him), the conference symbols, protocol, etc.—today observers are trying to "sound out" the extent of the underwater part of this iceberg.

A difficult task, let us say so frankly. Politicians who have despised one another for decades and who are full of grudges and claims against each other are gathered around the negotiating table. No one knows for sure how real their officially declared positions are, where the in-depth defense maneuvers are, where a surprise attack is possible, or in what and on which flank to expect mutual concessions. The atmosphere of general mistrust is also promoted by the fact that the old stereotype of U.S. "allied commitments" in respect of Israel has been destroyed. A correspondent for THE WASHINGTON POST, for example, writes from Madrid: "For Israel the conference which has begun is a football match at which the spectators are certainly not impartial and the referee's objectivity is doubtful."

It seems to us, incidentally, that the collapse of the old stereotypes makes it possible to find additional answers to a question which is also not an easy one: What, strictly speaking, is the role of the Soviet Union at this conference? Today the local press and observers are raising this question again and again, despite the fact (and maybe precisely because of it) that yesterday President G. Bush was really profuse in expressions of gratitude to the Soviet Union and its president for participating in the conference and doing a lot of work to convene it.

Newspapers cite what would appear to be devastating arguments. The chief among them is that precisely the United States now holds all the real levers for influencing Israel and the Arabs, while the weakened Soviet Union, occupied with its own problems, has now been deprived of these levers. And many facts which hurt our pride are cited. It is hard to argue with many of them. They are on the surface. We ourselves felt this when, before the news conference, we stood endlessly waiting outside the iron railings of the Soviet Embassy (we repeat—Soviet, not U.S.) and watched the "White House press" proudly walk past to the seats allocated to it in advance.

We could cite other examples of the same kind. But they would all be unable to refute (and we say this once again, not afraid of repeating ourselves) the immutable truth that the Madrid conference would not have taken place without the USSR's participation. And if we have been unable to convince our readers of this in our previous reports, permit us to turn for assistance to the well-known transatlantic commentator A. Rosenthal. This is what he writes in THE NEW YORK TIMES: "The most important Soviet contribution to the conference lies not in twisting the arms of former allies but in giving the Arabs what they need most of all—a symbolic cover. The Arabs would never have taken a positive view of a diplomatic initiative on which they would have seen the sole stamp: 'Made in USA.' Since Washington has always taken only a pro-Israeli stance, the Arabs were not burning with a desire to participate in a 'U.S.' peace conference and wanted this forum to be 'international.' They would not have gone to a purely U.S. show. The Soviet Union supported them, albeit symbolically, and thus gave them the possibility of participating in the talks."

But now the talks have begun. What next?

Next a crossword, a rebus, a charade—call this enigma what you like, but there is no clear-cut answer to it here. One thing is clear: All the participants in the talks will play their own game, bearing long-term and short-term goals in mind. To judge from Shamir's statements today, Israel intends to protect its "first line" of defense over the next few days. For the time being it does not accept any "freezing" of the settlements in the West Bank or any exchange according to the "peace for land" principle. But the U.S. side is insisting on just this, firmly with regard to the Israeli settlements and evasively in respect of the territories seized by Israel as a result of the 1967 war. It says they must be returned, but far from all of them—hence the possibility of a compromise.

But if Shamir makes no concession, we do not believe he will see the cherished $10 billion in U.S. credit. Therefore his immediate task is to hold out to begin with, to avoid any substantial concessions, and then to receive his domestic "prize"—reelection for the next four years. But in the long term (which is the hardest thing for him) his task is somehow to keep at least part of the Golan Heights, getting diplomatic recognition from Syria in return. Incidentally, this is precisely what Damascus certainly does not want to do.

Strange though this may seem, there are greater prospects for Israel's separate talks with the Palestinians who form a joint delegation with Jordan. The Palestinians' demand to be granted the right today to create their own state, moreover with its capital in East Jerusalem, sounds unrealistic if only because Washington does not support them in this. However, as agreed in advance, this ticklish nuance will be gotten around at the conference. But the prospect of autonomy and of "freezing" the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories is perfectly real.

Indeed, as you see, if the peace talks are going to develop, it is impossible to manage without compromises. The conference can "triumph" only if none of the sides participating in the talks achieves its own victory.

All the conference participants declare both in official statements and, particularly, in interviews that they have come to Madrid with an open heart. If this is so, it is good. But it is still better if they have come with open eyes.

But let us tear ourselves away from the peripeteias of the conference itself, because intensive bilateral contacts between heads of state and leaders of foreign policy departments are taking place outside the conference framework during these days. It is impossible to keep track of them all and talk about them. We will touch only on what is of the greatest interest to us. The Soviet president received a "sweet dessert" even before the start of his lunch with Spanish Premier F. Gonzalez, when the two leaders met with journalists. Whereas previously these two politicians called each other "senor" and then "comrade," yesterday the word "friend" was heard. And it has to be said that this expression from Gonzalez' mouth is not lip service to protocol but reflects the Spanish leader's sincere attitude toward our president, who is clearly short of friends today. This, incidentally, was also manifested at the time of the August putsch. On the most difficult day—19 August—F. Gonzalez not only sharply condemned the coup but also demanded to be put through by telephone to Gorbachev without delay. When the voice at our end of the telephone wire refused, the spirited premier in a fit of temper let fall an unmentionable Spanish word, which appeared in all the local newspapers the next day.

But yesterday, thank God, there was every reason to speak the warmest words reflecting the close cooperation and mutual understanding between the two figures. F. Gonzalez announced at the news conference that Spain has reopened the 1.5-billion [currency not specified] credit for the Soviet Union, which was suspended after the putsch. The need for this money is obvious to us, but if the "technical difficulties," as Gonzalez politely called the chaos in our economy and the confusion in the echelons of power, continue, then we will not see this credit. Nor the others, incidentally.

Pankin Addresses Talks

LD0111185491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Madrid, 1 Nov (TASS)—"The Madrid conference may become a turning point in the future of a whole region," USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin said today, speaking at the Middle East peace conference. The peoples of the Middle East have received a prospect for a peaceful settlement.

The road to Madrid was difficult and complex. In order to make it possible for the representatives of Israel and the Arab states to get together, obstacles had to be overcome which at times seemed insurmountable, the minister said. The Soviet Union has always been in favor of convening a Middle East forum that would provide an impetus to the search for solutions in the region. The chance to start a practical implementation of this idea appeared after the meeting of Presidents Gorbachev and Bush in Helsinki in September last year. The Soviet Union and the United States made a pledge to act together in the interests of a radical settlement in the Middle East. Undoubtedly, the interaction and cooperation of the two great powers became one of the decisive factors in making the convening of the Madrid conference possible.

B. Pankin outlined the vision of the key features in the peace process. According to him, in the first place the talks should lead the Arabs and Israel to a historic compromise that will help to leave behind the psychological, territorial, and national arguments now dividing the conflicting sides.

The formula of the historical compromise between the Arabs and Israel contains the central idea and the main aim of the settlement. In the end, there cannot be two opinions with regard to the fact that Resolution 242, which is the basis of our conference, contains the principle of exchanging territories for peace, the minister noted. This principle applies to "all fronts": to the West Bank of the Jordan River, to the Gaza Strip, and to the Golan Heights.

Second, during the settlement process, the tragedy of the 4 million Palestinian people, which has been going on for several decades already, should be ended. Palestinians have the right to self-determination, which is recorded in the UN Charter.

Third, an honorable and acceptable solution to the Jerusalem problem, agreeable to all, needs to be found. Religious interests, not only of the Middle East peoples but of the whole world, cross here. I think that seeking a common denominator in the positions of the sides will take a long time, and should be done carefully, while demonstrating tolerance and tactfulness in such an extremely delicate matter.

Fourth, it is necessary to ensure that UN Security Council Resolution 425 on the Lebanon is implemented.

Fifth, the solution to the question of regulating multilateral cooperation in the region is not to be left out in the difficult movement that has begun toward peace and security in the Middle East. After all, only the living fabric of trust and mutual understanding, strengthened by close ties and joint development, is capable of ensuring the genuine security of each and everyone.

The process of shaping the Middle East accord is to be begun at a time when the level of mutual trust in the region, unfortunately, is at a very low mark, the minister pointed out. In the first place, I mean the uncontrolled arms race. The Middle East is sorry witness to how the unbridled stockpiling of deadly arsenals not only is exhausting the material resources of states, but also is cultivating dangerous militarized thinking, which is turning the whole region into a minefield, speaking figuratively. The well-known events in the Persian Gulf are a tragic example of the consequences of uncontrolled arming beyond the limits of reasonable sufficiency [sverkhvooruzhennost].

The problems are to be resolved at the negotiating table if we want hostility and mistrust to be replaced by a historic compromise between the Arabs and Israel, and perhaps subsequently by the building of a common "Middle East" home.

It is important that immediately after the plenary sittings we move in an organized way to discussing concrete questions in bilateral working groups. We are convinced that this must begin here, in Madrid, without losing the tempo already gained.

B. Pankin gave assurances that the Soviet Union intends, in the capacity of cochairman, to actively further the formation of an atmosphere favorable for attaining accord.

I am deeply convinced that the time of creators has come in the Middle East. Let us do everything we can to ensure that the road is open for them, the minister said in conclusion.

Pankin, Baker Give News Conference

LD0111225891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1552 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS special correspondents Gennadiy Petrov, Yuriy Pometov, Viktor Khrekov, and Vladimir Shekhovtsov]

[Text] Madrid 1 Nov (TASS)— "It seems to us that today, despite everything, we can feel more optimistic." This was the careful diplomatic phrase with which USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin opened a joint news conference with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on the outcome of the plenary meetings of the Near East peace conference taking place here. "Even though the parties to the conference still have differing perceptions of how movement toward that peace should be effected, of the sequence of steps to be taken and of priorities, all of them agree in broad terms on the main point—a fresh page has to be turned in the war among them. The Soviet Union and the United States see their task as being to ensure that this occurs as quickly as possible. That has been the logic of our joint actions in the period of preparation for the conference and while it has been working. And Secretary of State Baker and I have agreed to continue to follow that line even after the end of the plenary meetings," the minister added.

"The aim of the next phase of the peace process," he noted, "is to fix up talks in the framework of bilateral and multilateral working groups." At the same time Pankin and Baker admitted that as yet it has not been possible to achieve an understanding on the venue for the bilateral talks. Even so, they voiced the hope that the next stage of the conference would get under way also in Madrid and in the very near future. The world will not understand us if the conference fails to resume and the parties are unable to sit down again at the negotiating table solely because they cannot agree on a venue, said the U.S. secretary of state. But we have already seen parties renouncing maximalist positions, though as yet there is still a high degree of emotion around. But Baker hinted at the possibility of the bilateral talks getting under way in Madrid in the next two days when he remarked that "I am not intending to change my plans" and that he wants to leave the Spanish capital on the evening of 3 November. The logical thing is that the first point on the agenda at the bilateral talks might be the question of where they are to be held from now on. I feel moderately optimistic, he said. "The view of the chairmen is that the conference should resume actually in Madrid." Both Baker and Pankin stressed this in practically the same words.

Answering journalists' questions, the secretary of state said the United States does not intend to link progress in the negotiating process to the rendering of economic assistance to countries in the region. Similarly, we do not intend to criticize or condemn anyone's position. Our task is to do everything we can to assist the negotiating process, Baker emphasized.

The USSR foreign minister, in answering questions, announced that "a staged moratorium on weapons sales to the countries of the Near East is on the agenda." But this could only be tackled once the present stage of a settlement in the region is completed, he noted.

Egyptian Envoy Views Soviet Role

PM0411103991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Nov 91 p 5

[Interview with Ahmad Mahir al-Sayyid, Egyptian ambassador to the USSR, by V. Chemodin; date and place not specified, under the general heading: "Reason Must Prevail"]

[Text] [Chemodin] The Near East peace conference is continuing its work in Madrid. What is your opinion of this event, and what are the prospects of settling the Arab-Israeli conflict in your view?

[Al-Sayyid] Needless to say, the mere fact that a peace conference has been convened, involving all interested parties, cochaired by the Soviet Union and the United States, and with UN and European observers, is evidence that an important new phase is beginning for mankind in its endeavor to secure peace in the region. We are bound to feel optimistic looking back over the path we have covered since the idea of convening a conference emerged and over the major obstacles that we have managed to overcome.

Egypt has some experience of talks with Israel. We are well aware how difficult Israel is as a negotiating partner and how it always tries to get the most it can for itself. However, we also know something else—if we insistently uphold our own rights and interests, using flexible, reasonable methods of negotiation based on sober analysis of the situation, we can get results leading to the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. At the negotiating table Egypt has been able to get its captured territories liberated—something that it began fighting for during the October war back in 1973. So, we have moved on to building peace by giving up the principles of toughening positions and military confrontation.

We want to help other Arab countries obtain similar results today—the liberation of the occupied Arab lands in Gaza; the West Bank, including Jerusalem, of course; the Golan Heights; and southern Lebanon—which would enable the conflicting sides to live in peace, security, and cooperation in the future.

[Chemodin] The positive changes that have taken place in the world arena over the last few years have hitherto affected the Near East least of all. Do you think that these positive tendencies will affect the atmosphere of the conference now?

[Al-Sayyid] A new era also necessitates new international behavior. Israel cannot challenge the prevailing world order. Occupying other people's territory will not make it possible to secure peace, just as a faulty, illegal peace will not be a lasting peace.

[Chemodin] I have often heard that the Soviet Union's role and influence in the Near East have appreciably weakened as a result of events in our country. Do you agree with that?

[Al-Sayyid] Egypt has always said that the Soviet Union must without fail take part in an international conference devoted to solving the problem of the Near East. Despite its current difficulties, the Soviet Union has continued to make vigorous efforts to convene a peace conference, and this has met with satisfaction in the Arab world. This illustrates that the Soviet Union still plays an active role in Near East affairs.

Conference Demonstrates 'Realism'

LD0311132391 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 3 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Subbotin]

[Text] Damascus November 3 TASS—The first phase of the Madrid Middle East peace conference has demonstrated the realism of the stand of the Arabs who firmly insist on regarding the United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the "land for peace" principle as the basis for its work, which also corresponds to the U.S. and Soviet approaches, Khalid al-Fahum, chairman of the Palestine National Salvation Front (PNSF), told TASS. The first meetings at the conference showed Israel's "obstinacy", he said.

"Our demands are well known. We press for Israel's withdrawal from the West Bank, Gaza sector and East Jerusalem. Then there should be a transional period under the patronage of the United Nations and, subsequently, the exercise of the Palestinians' right to self-determination, the PNSF leader said.

"If Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir's way of thinking does not undergo changes and Israel continues to seek to take hold of land, the future of the Middle East peace process looks pessimistic," Khalid al-Fahum emphasised.

Anwar Razh, member of the Central Committee of the Palestine People's Liberation Front (main command) and the editor-in-chief of ILA AL-AMAM journal, believes that the convocation of the Madrid conference is a U.S. attempt to gather the fruits of the Gulf crisis and consolidate its political presence in the region.

The conference is being dominated by the obstructionism of Israel which is busy imposing its terms, relying on effective support from the United States, Anwar Razh told TASS.

Palestinian Envoy on Israeli Role

PM0111120791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Oct 91 p 3

[Interview with Sa'id Abu-'Imarah, envoy extraordinary of the State of Palestine in the USSR, by Yu. Subbotin under the general heading "The Conference Has Opened in Madrid"; date and place of interview not stated: "Land for Peace"]

[Text] [Subbotin] The disunity of the Arab world was for many years its Achilles heel. And this was skillfully exploited by masters of the "divide and conquer" policy. At the Madrid conference the representatives of the Arab people of Palestine form part of a single delegation with Jordan. Does this mean that the position of the whole delegation on the key issues of a Near East settlement is also united?

[Abu-'Imara] Yes, the delegation intends to speak from united positions. Moreover, this common platform has been formulated not just within the framework of the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. It is also shared by the other Arab participants in the conference. It is based on fulfillment of the well-known UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principle of "land for peace." The Arab countries are thus demonstrating their desire to restore peace in the region and comply with principles of international legality. Of course, the Palestinians intend to discuss their specific problems at the conference, and the Jordanians intend to discuss theirs, but, as I have already said, on the basis of a common platform.

[Subbotin] Could you disclose the essence of this platform in a little more detail?

[Abu-'Imarah] First and foremost it involves the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories, the realization of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and to their own statehood, and also the right of all countries in the region to live in peace. Strictly speaking, this is also the essence of the UN resolutions that I mentioned and the "land for peace" principle.

[Subbotin] What is your assessment of Israel's current position?

[Abu-'Imarah] Unfortunately, Israel is stubbornly taking an intransigent and, in our view, unconstructive position. On the one hand it has agreed to participate in a conference that will inevitably take place against the background of Resolutions 242 and 338. But on the other hand, the statements being made by its leaders force one to doubt their intention to resolve the region's problems on a just basis, and consequently to doubt the success of the conference itself. After all, without a discussion of the problem of the occupied territories, the discussions about other problems relating to water supply or the ecology, for example, will come to nothing. This was confirmed by a meeting of the foreign ministers of the five Arab countries that took place in Damascus just before the conference. If, as before, Israel is going to repeat its resolve not to yield an inch of the foreign land it seized, how can there be any question of success at the conference?

An extremely favorable situation now prevails for a Near East settlement. The Arab countries are prepared to hold talks with Israel. They recognize its right to peaceful coexistence with its neighbors. The Palestinians, and I think that any unprejudiced observer recognizes this, are currently displaying very great flexibility. But we are afraid that, because of its stubbornness, Israel will let slip this historic opportunity.

[Subbotin] The Israeli side's uncompromising attitude to the territorial question and also its unwillingness to deal with the PLO are usually attributed to considerations of its own security. Do you find this argument convincing?

[Abu-'Imarah] In my opinion, modern wars have demonstrated quite convincingly that nobody's security can be guaranteed by force of arms and methods of aggression and occupation. Nowadays any state's security can only be guaranteed by lasting peace with its neighbors. The very geography of Israel dictates this condition. It is located in the midst of Arab countries. Without genuine peace with them it is impossible to speak of security for that state. I think that sober-minded Israelis understand this perfectly well. They also know that the Palestinian people's right to their own statehood is recognized by the world community. The Palestinians are fighting for this right alone, and not for the annihilation of Israel.

[Subbotin] You mentioned the world community. What is your assessment of the current positions of the USSR, the United States, the European countries on and, last, of the UN role in the issues of a Near East settlement?

[Abu-'Imarah] From the start we would not have wanted the conference to have a purely regional character, since international security as a whole depends on security in our region. Earlier we supported the very idea of an international conference on the Near East put forward by the USSR and involving the USSR, the United States, and other interested states. We are of course relying on the more active UN role that has been demonstrated in settling conflicts in other regions. Moreover, it seems that this organization should promote the implementation of its own resolutions, which in Iraq's case, however, it did extremely eloquently. We are not of course demanding that Israel should be dealt with in the same way as Iraq, but it would be nice if at least part of the same resolve were manifested in this repect.

Following Iraq's defeat, people in Israel understand perfectly well that there is no longer a real counterweight to their own country in the region, no force they would undoubtedly have to reckon with. But this is very dangerous. Henceforth the temptation arises to resolve contentious issues by force. Therefore a special responsibility lies on the shoulders of the conference cochairmen—the USSR and the United States.

[Subbotin] Why, knowing Israel's position and not seeing any definite future for the conference that is about to start, have the Palestinians nevertheless agreed to take part in it? Is this not, as some believe, a sign of a weakening in the positions of the Palestinian opposition movement?

[Abu-'Imarah] The Palestinian liberation movement was always strong in that it was fighting for a just cause. Through all the years of occupation our people have not submitted to it and will not submit in the future. And our participation in the conference is not a sign of weakness, of course, but evidence of an understanding of the realities of our time, when more can be achieved around the negotiating table than on the battlefields, and evidence of our people's goodwill. And, of course, a reflection of our hopes that peace is nonetheless possible.

[Subbotin] One wants to be optimistic. But if after all the conference brings no tangible results, what will the Palestinians' next moves be?

[Abu-'Imarah] Our strategic choice is a desire for peace. But this does not mean a rejection of the Palestinian people's right to fight against the occupation using other means. The Palestinian uprising—the intifadah—has been going on now for about three years. And the struggle will continue until we are victorious.

Propaganda, Recriminations Reported

PM0111225191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Nov 91 Union Edition p 7

[Report by special correspondents V. Vernikov and A. Ostalskiy: "Can You Have a Conference Without Dialogue? Mutual Recriminations and Propaganda Warfare Across the Table in Madrid"]

[Text] Madrid—The second day of the Madrid Peace Conference on the Near East, as opposed to the first euphoria-filled day, returned the world to bitter reality. The "mortal enemies," assembled around the same table for the first time ever, hear but do not listen to one another. The rhetoric is becoming increasingly uncompromising, and mutual recriminations are the customary modus operandi.

Previously Israeli delegations, at the United Nations or at international conferences, for example, would usually walk out as soon as Arab representatives started talking about Israeli aggression or genocide against the Palestinians. And the Arabs would do precisely the same when the Israelis accused them of manifold sins. This time, however, when the sides are separated by just a few yards of table, they clearly have first to patiently hear out the disagreable speeches from start to finish. And no one has dared to leave the conference for fear of being accused of wrecking it.

Does this perhaps already signal some progress?

The abrasive, uncompromising language is more designed for their own public opinion than those sitting here in the conference hall. The speeches of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir and Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' were essentially the toughest. The former stated that the Near East conflict is not territorial in essence and that if the talks concentrate principally and solely on territory, failure will be the outcome. The Syrian minister, on the contrary, insisted that if the problem of liberating the occupied territories is not tackled, his country will not take part in the multilateral talks planned as part of the conference.

In the dialectical dispute with his Syrian opponent the Israeli prime minister not only expounded the classic Zionist version of the history of Palestine and Israel ("This land held no attraction to others. No one wanted it."), but also dismissed the potential UN role in settling the conflict. The argument "it was not the United Nations which created Israel" seemed pretty odd to us... Then who did? In Shamir's opinion, the main problem of the conflict is the existence of Israel, and he urged the Arab countries to recognize it and enter into direct talks with it.

After these statements the Arabs no longer found attractive his appeals for cooperation and for "resolving all possible disagreements solely by talks based on goodwill and mutual tolerance." Palestinian delegation representative Hanan 'Ashrawi reacted instantly at her own press conference, stating that the speech by the head of the Israeli Government causes "deep indignation, it is the tone of an occupier, it is a provocative statement, but we will not succumb to provocation."

At the conference press center members of the Palestinian delegation were "hunted" on all three floors of the "Glass Palace." We managed to talk to the delegation's political adviser, 'Aziz Amru [name as transliterated].

"Shamir's speech proves just one thing: His government does not actually want peace," he said.

"But why in that case did the Palestinians agree to take part in the conference?"

The answer that followed was frank, albeit unconstructive:

"To expose Israel's true intention to the whole world."

And subsequent speeches at the conference by Kamil Abu-Jabir, Jordanian foreign minister; Faris Buwayz, head of the Lebanese delegation; and H. 'Abd-al-Shafi, chief Palestinian representative; were couched in the same tough vein and put the matter in an unambiguous way: Israel should agree to liberate all the territories occupied by it in 1967. And only then could it count on peace and security among its Arab neighbors. But Israel must first stop building settlements on those lands and allow Palestinian refugees to return home.

The propaganda duel continued.

The Syrians are demanding talks before talks, putting forward prior conditions—countered Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Netanyahu at his briefing.

However, given the will, it is also possible to find purely constructive elements in the speeches of the Syrian and Palestinian delegates. And the Israeli prime minister did also avoid on this occasion his usual tough talk: "We will not give a single inch of territory." And the aforementioned Netanyahu even told journalists that the question of the territories could be discussed, but only behind closed doors. His unprecedented gesture of a separate news conference solely for Arab journalists also took everyone aback.

In short, it seems that the hostile tone prevailing in official speeches does not correspond to what is happening behind the scenes of the Madrid conference. So,

despite all their threats and warnings, the Israelis preferred to pretend that they had not noticed the references to the PLO in a Palestinian representative's speech (otherwise "according to the rules" they would have had to walk out of the conference). Journalists are getting information (rumors) of mysterious nighttime visits and secret meetings of delegates, U.S. and Egyptian mediation, and a "special Jordanian role..."

It is clear that something is nevertheless really afoot, since at the last moment agreement does appear to have been reached on the time and place for the start of bilateral talks—Monday, in the vicinity of Madrid. Officially, admittedly, there is nothing on this score, but a trustworthy source has definitely informed us of this. If such talks do begin, this itself would mark an important step forward—away from never ending enmity toward normal dialogue.

This is how USSR Foreign Minister B. Pankin assessed the first two days of work:

"It is natural that each delegation should seek to articulate its position as firmly as possible. There is, therefore, nothing to unduly alarm us here."

When asked by us what he spoke about during his meeting with Yitzhaq Shamir, the minister answered:

"It was a working meeting as part of the conference, basically on the procedures for conducting it. There was nothing extraordinary to be expected from it. But we did, of course, also discuss bilateral relations. We did not go into detail, but we did decide to exchange ambassadors without long delay. It is clear that this will enable us to step up bilateral ties."

Friday is the final working day of the first phase of the conference. Everyone hopes that it will be continued.

PRAVDA Assesses Progress

PM0311183891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 91 p 5

[Article by Valeriy Volkov and Tomas Kolesnichenko: "View From Madrid: The Main Thing Is Not To Stop the Clock"]

[Text] Madrid—"Thousands of glasses," in the words of the poet, are trained on Madrid. But the one thing that has been lacking this week is Shakespeare. If the sea is reflected in a drop of water, you could say that in recent days a whole ocean of human passions on a truly Shakespearean scale has been reflected in Madrid. The aura of power and its weaknesses, hatred, fear, hypocrisy, hopes, secret intrigues, and, of course, Hamlet's eternal question: "To be or not to be?"

Although the ghost of Hamlet still hovers over the T-shaped table at which the 56 participants in the Madrid peace conference are assembled, the main question associated with it has already been decided. It opened on 30 October, and the first stage ended yesterday. As our colleague from CNN observed, all those days were historic. The first day, because the conference had finally opened; the other days, because no one left the negotiating table. And that in itself offers hope, great hope. After all, the main thing is not to stop the clock. And if next week the direct talks between Israel and each of the Arab delegations continue, this will at least mean a real breaking down of the psychological barriers that divide the two sides. Of course, that is only a beginning, and the clouds of skepticism have not dispersed over Madrid. On 31 October, for instance, when the sides set forth their positions, they remained—as was expected—on opposite sides of a wide gulf. The Palestinian representative called Shamir's speech provocative, and the Israeli premier, when a journalist asked for his views on the Arab delegates' speeches, shrugged and replied: "The same old lies."

So, on closing the first stage of the conference, Baker and Pankin could only express moderate optimism for the future.

But still optimism. If only because what is happening in Madrid is not some kind of spontaneous event or venture. It is, as we used to be fond of saying, the "imperative of the time." And so we believe that this event must be viewed seriously. Of course, you could compare it to a Hollywood production, as some people are saying in the press here. Especially since it is true that the director is American and Washington is playing the main role. That is how it looks, so to speak, on the surface. But the others are not mere extras. And if Shakespeare is right that all the world's a stage and all the men and women merely players, then the "game" involves millions of people in the Near East, and the stake is peace, that is to say, life.

From the old orthodox viewpoint it is not difficult to reduce the Madrid meeting to just another manifestation of "U.S. diktat," and to accuse the Soviet Union of "Americanizing" its position and making concessions to Washington. And to accuse the latter, moreover, of greedily trying to gain total control of Near Eastern oil. Why not? After all, Bush and Baker are both from Texas, which reeks of oil. So it must be true. But let us try to look into it more deeply.

The Madrid peace conference is a historic event, if only because it became possible only as a result of historic events in the world arena, first and foremost the transformation of Soviet-U.S. relations from the stage of confrontation and rivalry to the sphere of partnership and cooperation.

Our adversaries will doubtless say: The USSR has grown so weak that it follows the U.S. course unreservedly. Partnership does not come into it, when we have lost our Arab allies and they have lost our support.

We reply: The USSR has indeed been weakened, and incidentally the Near East, especially Lebanon, provides a very instructive illustration—a kind of warning, a call

for caution, urging us to think again. But in this specific case the operative factor is not our weakness, but our strength. This lies primarily in the fact that we have at last removed the ideological blinders from our eyes.

And anyway, what has actually happened? In what way are we "submitting" to Washington? By ceasing to give our unreserved support (we stress "unreserved") to all the Arabs' demands?

But in that case Washington could also be said to have gone back on its word. It no longer gives unreserved support to all Israel's demands, and does not share all its positions. So it evens out. And it is due to one and the same thing—the end of the cold war. In those days Israel was, so to speak, a U.S. stronghold and base in the Near East in the struggle against Soviet influence. Our Arabists also used to say that Israel was "a pistol held at the heads of the Arab peoples," and that the pistol was in the hands of the United States. And to some extent that was true. Although posters depicting a gallant Arab shoving his bayonet in an Israel's face hung in prominent places in Arab capitals and small towns.

It also used to be said that we must defend the Arabs because they have chosen the "path of socialism." Tens and maybe hundreds of dissertations were defended on this "path."

But today everyone chooses his own path. Soviet-U.S. rivalry has ended. The deideologization of world politics and the change in the overall situation immediately deprived Israel of its former status. That fact must not be lost sight of. And although links—and very close ones—with Washington remained (there is the influential lobby of what we call "persons of Jewish nationality," the traditions and similarity of the "democracies," and so forth), nonetheless Israel lost what was most important—its immunity. And Washington made this clear to Israel. As one of the main characters in the movie "The Godfather" says, they made them an offer they couldn't refuse.

As for the Arabs, they made their own choice. States, like people, cannot live in the past. True, we helped the Arabs as best we could, often to our own detriment, but this aid long ago turned into something ideological, into a firm anti-Israeli position on our part. We were, so to speak, a counterweight to the United States on the Arab side. The only concrete help we gave was with weapons. Life itself has changed the political situation.

It was the Arabs' choice that the majority of their states supported the anti-Husayn coalition and thereby determined a new U.S. role in the region. All these are new and inescapable realities in the Near East, and whether the orthodox believers like it or not, they have to be reckoned with. That is why, from our point of view, the peace conference on the Near East that is now under way in Madrid cannot be assessed from the old standpoints. Washington has no need to enact scenarios or Hollywood shows here; the United States, like the USSR, first and foremost for the sake of its own national interests, needs peace there, and this is also the need of those whom we always cherished so much—the future generations. Without peace in the Near East there can be no new order in the 21st century. Finally, there will not be the single world space that is so necessary for universal prosperity and an efficient economy. So if you were to ask who will win an "Oscar" in Madrid, it will not actually be the Americans. We would award it for the "best foreign film of the year," the film in which the Arabs and Israel have parts.

But the director is American. In fact, although the fact is carefully concealed, there is a detailed "Bush plan." Without claiming infallibility, we would like to mention some of its components.

First. "Freeze" Israeli settlements in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Second. Put pressure on Israel to grant the Palestinians first self-government, and then limited autonomy, as much autonomy, as Yeltsin once said, "as they can swallow." Of course, this is with a view to weakening the PLO. Third. Secure some form of Israeli-Syrian agreement on the Golan Heights, and in particular an agreement with Lebanon, because here it is easy to make a "goodwill gesture" and withdraw Israeli forces from the south of that country. In short, progress in talks with Lebanon and the Palestinians would open up the way for the most difficult, but at the same time realistic, success.

For the time being Bush and Baker are making a point of not interfering in the course of events at the conference, allowing steam to be let off, and, in a word, waiting. And that will apparently continue until January or the beginning of February. But it is also dangerous for Washington to leave it too late. It is clear that the "window of opportunity" cannot be opened earlier than the summer, by which time election campaigns will be in full swing in Israel and the United States. Whatever else may happen, a presidential candidate cannot ignore the voice of the Jews in the United States. And Shamir will have to avoid showing any sign of "spinelessness." Evidently Washington's main levers for putting pressure on both sides will be used before the summer. But it will be the carrot rather than the stick. If, for instance, Israel takes a sensible line, it can expect not only the promised $10 billion from the United States, but as much again from Germany, Japan, and other sponsors, who, of course, will not refuse Washington this small request. There is also a carrot in store for the Arabs—the establishment of a development bank specially for them in the region, the direct investments that everyone needs now. That is by way of "arm-twisting," so to speak. And so it seems to us that the chances of achieving peace in the Near East are very real.

But we would like to end on a different note. Since this is a view from Madrid, let us take a look at our own problems from here. We have already written—as have many others, no doubt—that here in Spain, in ancient times, three great religions and their adherents coexisted peacefully: Christians, Arabs, and Jews. But let us

remember that then there came other times, the fires of the inquisition flared up, the "witch-hunt" began, with intolerance and hostility toward one another. Those who worshiped non-Christian gods were forced to leave Spain, and the country ceased to be the great power of its time.

We very much want the Near East peace conference to culminate in success. But to be honest, what we want even more is for this same success not to pass us by.

Pogodin Comments on Results

LD0111153591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Text] The first major positive result is the conference has opened. It opened despite the fact that up to the last moment there was the menace the conference would be ruined. The menace was due to the sharp contradictions in the stance of the direct participants in the Arab-Israeli conflict and a series of terrorist acts in the Middle East. Without doubt, the conference opened thanks to the big role of the political activity and persistence of its cochairman, the United States and the Soviet Union. That was duly appreciated in the speeches of both Arab and Israeli officials. It is necessary to use the unique chance that has opened for peace in the region. A settlement is possible only on the basis of a desire of the conflicting sides to mutually acceptable compromises for mutual concessions. Those were the high points of the speeches made by President Mikhail Gorbachev and President George Bush, who confirmed a large area of accord on the problem as well as a determination to keep pressing together for the solution of the problem. But of course, the USSR and the United States are no more than middlemen whose role is reduced to giving good offices. The settlement itself is up to the Arabs and Israelis. It is common knowledge that their initial positions are totally opposite, which was reflected in the speeches of the leaders of the delegations during the first days of the conference.

The second major positive result is that all sides have arrived at the conclusion the dialogue should be continued. Accord has been reached about the time and the venue of the second stage of the conference, which will be the direct bilateral talks between delegations of Israel and Arab representatives. There even appeared signs of some softening of stance of the sides amounting to ultimatums. For one the Palestinian representative spoke of the possible autonomy for a certain period to be followed by the creation of an independent Palestinian state. Observers saw in the Israeli prime minister's speech hints for a possible readiness to hold talks on the territorial issue as well. So far, naturally all these things are no more than weak symptoms of an intention to seek accord. There is a general conviction that the direct talks will be long and hard but that can be expected as a matter of fact since the burden of animosity and distrust of the past more than four decades is too heavy. It is also likely that there will be long intervals in the talks and even statements by the sides calling to stop the talks altogether. It is [word indistinct] to recall that this was how things moved in the settlements in Angola or Cambodia but as result solutions were found. Although the knot of the Middle East conflict is much tighter, there is real hope that the dialogue now under way will sooner or later bring about lasting peace, which is needed so much by both the people of the Middle East as well as by the whole of the international community.

Program Reviews International Role, Events

LD0311202391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1330 GMT 3 Nov 91

["The World This Week: International Review" program with Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, observer for All-Union Radio, and IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin]

[Text] [Levin] Our program always tackles international problems and we will try not to abandon that principle today. However, our domestic problems, which naturally affect our country's international situation, became so dramatic this week that they affected literally everything, including the main international event of the week, the opening in Madrid...

[Bovin, interrupting] Forgive me. Perhaps I am a more relaxed individual. All the same, how can you talk about drama? Look at what happened in Madrid. The events we witnessed there really were dramatic. Shouldn't we be looking at the way Madrid affected our situation, rather than the other way around?

[Levin] Let me explain. The Madrid peace conference on a Near East settlement had two cochairmen, the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Bovin] Yes, that is right.

[Levin] A meeting took place there between two presidents, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev of the USSR and George Bush of the United States. Mikhail Sergeyevich then made a short visit to France, where he met French President Francois Mitterrand. Many of our listeners and journalistic colleagues are wondering what role our president played in Madrid in light of events back home. Is he....

[Bovin, interrupting] In my view...

[Levin, interrupting] Is he Bush's equal or...

[Bovin, interrupting] In my view that is childish talk. What do equal and unequal mean? He is a lawfully elected president. As long as he retains that position, he is in that sense equal to Bush, another lawfully elected President. His powers have not yet been abolished by anybody in the Soviet Union. In that sense I don't think there can be any reservations about this.

[Levin] But, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, the Soviet Union has itself been abolished for all intents and purposes.

[Bovin] Well, yes. But I don't believe in using such drastic expressions as disintegration and abolition. Let us put it another way. Something new is being formed in the place where the Soviet Union used to be. For the time being—and this interim phase will last a very long time—there are certain threads which bind the components of this community together. There are thousands, millions of these threads at the moment, in spite of all the declarations of independence. There will also be a symbol—if you like—of this. Is not Gorbachev this symbol at the moment? We still have a flag—at the moment. We have a capital. We have a national anthem. And we have Gorbachev. He is a symbol of this.

Let us go back 10 years to that glorious period of stagnation, when cheap vodka was plentiful and sausage was also still cheap. Why were we a superpower then? After all—if you don't mind my saying so—our economy was the most inefficient one in all the countries of the northern hemisphere. In terms of economic development, we languished somewhere among the developed countries of the Third World. The same applied to our standard of living. In all the main parameters of quality of life, we simply were not a developed power. So why were we a superpower? Why?

[Levin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, I recall your own expression: Upper Volta with missiles!

[Bovin] Actually it is not mine; I was only quoting it. We were only a superpower because we had those toys which we loved so much. Are you telling me that we no longer have those weapons? Have they disappeared somewhere? Has Gorbachev been deprived of that little suitcase, the one that operates those favorite toys of ours? No, nothing has changed. All those reasons for which we were considered a superpower remain valid. And we all have to acknowledge that all those things are still in Gorbachev's hands, to put it bluntly.

Of course, very many things have changed. There is no end of insulting things you could say, if you wanted to, about our country and about our president. But on the whole, we remain a ranking world power, if only for the reason I just mentioned. Our nuclear missile capability is equal to that of the United States. There is no getting away from that, so to speak. Nothing has changed on that score. As far as Gorbachev personally is concerned, it is a very difficult psychological task. After all, Bush, Thatcher, Mitterrand, and anyone else you care to mention treat Gorbachev with great respect. It is not simply because they do not want to offend him, but because they value the role that he has played in the effort to get us out of our impasse and put us on some sort of new track.

Peter the Great made Russia rear up on her hind legs, as it were, and he has made Russia rear up. It is another matter that the next task, the task of creating the new Russia, is not Gorbachev's business, if you do not mind me saying so, and not ours. We are the generation of sexagenarians, and Gorbachev is of the same generation. This is the swan song of this generation, if you like. Russia had to be made to rear up. She had to be dragged out of her barracks socialism. And that is what he did. And we helped him as we could.

But other people have to carry on. A new generation of leaders will come onto the scene—the 40-year-olds, for the sake of argument. It is a great pity that there are so few of them. But they will come; they will come. And they are going to have to build something on the ruins of despotism, the ruins of totalitarianism. I am oversimplifying, of course, but I am trying to propose a kind of broader general view of things. Of course, what is happening in our country at the moment is a terrible thing. Times are hard, and they will get even harder. And all this wretched talk of 500 days and 600 days and autumn 1992 is all really kindergarten stuff too.

The trouble is that a minimum of 10 years have to go by before we can breathe even a little easier. That is the minimum. And as far as anything serious is concerned, it is going to take around half a century. That is what we have to be ready for. We have somehow got to try to focus on that and call a halt somewhere and stop rolling downhill. Excuse me for straying a little from your introductory remarks about Madrid. This is why they take him more seriously abroad than perhaps people do at home now.

[Levin] That is the drama of the situation.

[Bovin] After the August events, of course. Everyone can see that. Everyone can also see the redistribution of roles between Yeltsin and Gorbachev. But you know what the difference between Gorbachev and Yeltsin is today? Gorbachev is already a great figure in the 20th century. Whatever else may happen, he has already secured this spot for himself, despite the fact that he may be a tragic figure.

But Yeltsin still has to secure this for himself. He has not achieved it yet. That is the difference between them, although in terms of what is topical now we understand of course that this shift has occurred. But, please God, we hope they will pull this wagon together, albeit with one putting greater stress on international affairs and the other on domestic affairs. I think it would be an ideal solution for this to continue for several years.

[Levin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, I have been listening to everything you are saying with great pleasure, because your views run very much along the lines of my own worries. And when I was talking about the drama of our recent events, I think that it stems from the fact that in the desire to destroy the old hypercentralized state we very frequently undertake actions which bring into doubt and jeopardize sensible things.

I have the feeling that all the republics are tugging at the formerly common blanket with such force that it will eventually tear into small pieces which will not even serve us as a fig leaf, if you will pardon the expression.

For instance, the issue has now been raised at a fairly high level—Yeltsin has talked about it—of sharply reducing the Soviet Union's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For what purpose? That is the question I immediately ask myself. We need a single foreign policy, do we not?

[Bovin] Excuse me, but we are again getting bogged down in the following way. As long as we have something that unites us—I will put it just like that for the moment—and as long as we have a president, State Council, and Supreme Soviet, these bodies will undoubtedly need a foreign policy department which will express some sort of residual common position on the international arena.

Of course, I interviewed both USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin and Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev. Naturally, psychologically, Kozyrev spoke more of that. Of course, the Foreign Ministry must be cut back sharply. But people should not simply be driven out of there. There are indeed hundreds of highly qualified staff there. Let us say, they could possibly be transferred to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Foreign Ministry or to other republics, if they will take them of course, so that, on the whole, they could work and be of some benefit. It is as easy as pie.

There should be some kind of coordinating functions, of course, since there is still not yet any coordination, and actions should be coordinated. There is the committee of the Foreign Ministry of the republics there now. But that means that perhaps the Foreign Ministry is not working efficiently enough. Something else must be done. But again, it seems that you have just been critical of that blanket which is being torn up into pieces. But as soon as you took up the Foreign Ministry's lining of that blanket, I felt like you wanted to tear it up immediately.

[Levin] On the contrary, good God no. I am precisely an adherent of preserving that community of interests which exists between all of us, of not destroying it now. But it seems to me that the threat lies in our common interests being torn up now.

[Bovin] Of course, they are being torn up, being torn up...

[Levin, interrupting] That is to the detriment of all of us.

[Bovin] That is clear to everybody. But...

[Levin, interrupting] That is not clear to everybody.

[Bovin] ...there are such situations, you realize, in which you, in which the first role, or violin rather, is played not by logic but by psychology. Well, at that...

[Levin, interrupting] Or even emotions.

[Bovin] Well, that is also an element.

[Levin] Or even emotions.

[Bovin] At that stage of development, after 70 or more years of that barracks socialism, as we put it, or of the socialist jail of the peoples—perhaps that is how it should be put—and after everybody has become dreadfully tired of us Russians, well, everybody just wants to catch their breath, and then there will be another tendency. I am sure of that. I am sure emotions will let up a bit, they will weigh things a bit. After all, how has the general balance of economic relations always been formed? Nevertheless, more fell to their lot than the contrary. And, therefore, they will be deprived of that...

[Levin, interrupting] Well, on the whole, the Russians have enough grievances.

[Bovin] Yes, they also have enough.

[Levin] But it is not time to count one's grievances. It seems to me that we must already be looking ahead now.

[Bovin] That is right. But real life does not conform to such things. And well, just now, it would be better to do this and then later... [changes thought] Well, now that the pendulum is swinging this way, and it is very difficult for it to reach the highest point of its swing if the force of inertia is very great, and then it will swing back again. Well, such a thing is happening now, and it is not the first time that it has happened to us.

[Levin] The most important thing is for one's head not to be under the pendulum at that moment. But let us return to international affairs. Since, nevertheless....

[Bovin] Yes, you recently took a trip to Madrid, I think.

[Levin] No, I was not in Madrid. During the preparations for Madrid I was on the trip to the Near East with our minister of foreign affairs. If you look at Madrid, well, from a global perspective, it seems to me that, after all, we are witnessing truly historic events. For the first time the Israelis and their Arab neighbors, including the Palestinians, have sat down at the same negotiating table. You were also in Israel recently and you know very well how many complex problems there are and...

[Bovin, interrupting] That is true, of course.

[Levin] Nevertheless, dialogue has begun.

[Bovin] Well, yes, all of that is splendid. But of course there is a saying: Practice makes perfect. It is sad, of course, and I would very much like to be wrong, but I am 90 percent sure that it will take a lot of practice, in the sense that they will not come to an agreement about anything. But you are right in saying that the very fact that they have agreed to sit down at the table, even if they do not come to an agreement at this phase, is already great progress. The Chinese are wise people. They say that it is better to hold talks than not to hold talks. [both laugh]

Well, let them hold talks. They will now go on to bilateral talks. In many ways, it will probably boil down to Syria saying: Give us back the Golan Heights. And Israel will say: We will not give back the Golan Heights! Well, this is what the talks will consist of, and they will end on this.

Nobody will come to an agreement on anything, as long as there is no shooting. And I think that now, even within the framework of that skeptical—so to speak—logic which they are proposing, there is one quite real thing which can happen, and that is that new wars will not be allowed to break out.

That is something that can be achieved now in the Near East, taking into account both the U.S. role and ours, and the fact that the Arabs and Israelis have indeed sat down at the same table. Within the framework of tackling this task, a new war must not be allowed to happen. So the Madrid conference does, so to speak, have some significance. That is the reality.

Let them set out their positions clearly for themselves and not lose their nerve too much. But they are simply not ready to bring their positions closer. Take any of the problems—the Golan Heights, the West Bank, Jerusalem, the refugees, settlements—whichever of the problems you look at, there is not yet any room for maneuver, because the Israeli demands are still absolute. And even when I was talking to Foreign Minister David Levi, he said to me—of course, he was speaking in Hebrew and an interpreter was translating for us—Jerusalem is and always will be the capital of Israel. And then he added in Russian: full stop. He said that in Russian. Well that is the mood.

And I found just the same mood when I talked with the Palestinians. Just the same. They all (?insist) the occupation forces must be withdrawn; that East Jerusalem will be the capital of a Palestinian state; and that this state will be a confederation with Jordan but will be independent. That is the position of the Arabs. As yet there are no points of contact between them. But let us bear in mind that this is not the last day of creation, if I can put it like that. History continues to move forward. And incidentally, the general atmosphere in the world is changing. There will be more changes of leaders and generations on both sides. On the whole I have an optimistic view of the prospects. But as for the immediate future, up to the end of the 20th century, I think we should concentrate on maintaining the status quo and preventing another war. That is the main thing we can and should be doing at present. That is my view.

[Levin] But in this connection, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, let us come back to the question with which I actually began our conversation, on the role of the Soviet Union, its international role, and in particular its role in the Near East and in preparing this conference. One sometimes hears it said that we are there in a supporting role to the Americans, at best playing second fiddle to them. But I do not think that is the case. We are actually playing an active role there.

[Bovin] I think so. Again, it is a shame to hear phrases like playing second fiddle and supporting role—this is simply words, not politics. Of course, let us be realistic...

[Levin, interrupting] Psychology, actually.

[Bovin] Yes, psychology. Of course, we are absorbed at present with our domestic affairs. It goes without saying that it is these issues which are taking up most of our attention, most of our concern, and most of our energies. For that reason it is of course true that of late we have been far less active in relation to the Near East than the Americans. But this is not because we did not want to. Far from it. But we have our own Near East on every corner.

And so the fact that there has been a meeting in Madrid and that things have gotten moving is indisputably 90 percent to the credit of the Americans. It is another question why this was necessary—that is clear. But this was something they did. But it is not right to talk about us playing a supporting role. This was our aim too; we too wanted this to happen, and our policy on this coincided absolutely with that of the Americans. It is just that we—Pankin, Bessmertnykh, or Shevardnadze—did not make 10 trips to the Near East. He had different concerns, whereas Baker decided to push on with it. Eight times! It is enough to drive you crazy. You could go crazy talking to all of these figures eight times over [laughs], but that is what he did.

But let me say it again: Yes, in reality, of course the Americans played a decisive role in this. As far as we are concerned, our influence there will of course continue to be less than that of the Americans. Why? Because the Americans have three fundamental strategic concerns there. The first is oil, and this concerns the entire region. The second is Israel, with whom they have their moral-strategic obligations. And the third is that they want to sort out their relations with the Arab world at the same time. Those are their three tasks.

We do not have any such tasks, anything so pressing. Up to now we have played on the same side as the Arabs, and precisely for this reason we were not in a position to play a role like the Americans; everyone was aware of our partiality. Now, however, we have restored relations with Israel, and at once the objective requirements have been laid for a more active foreign policy. Now we shall be rooting for both sides, like the Americans, where before it was just for one side.

This is fundamentally important. This is what we are now doing. This shows that we will have a part to play in the future development of events. Let me repeat. We will not be there every month or even every two months. But we will defend and uphold things which are in the interest of our state there. Forgive me for saying so, but our state also has interests in Israel. I do not know what percentage of the population there are our people. This is very important. Just think how much we lost there when our relations with Israel were bad, when we reviled all this, and spoke about Zionism. I talked to Sharon. He is an arch-hawk, but that is another matter. Who created Israel?, he asked me. It was 80,000 emigrants from Russia and Poland, from that region. They arrived with their Russian culture, with a tremendous attachment to that culture, and to Russians and Russia in general.

[Levin] By the way, when I was there I heard people claiming that Israel ranks second in the world in the number of Russian- language publications. It is probably true. Why whould anyone lie about such a thing?

[Bovin] Yes. Then, Sharon went on, we remember your position in 1948 when we were attacked for the first time and you helped us. We cannot forget that. But we also remember 1955, when you changed the situation. And I agreed with him. We lost a great deal there. We now have to recover what we lost then. The Americans, on the other hand, lost nothing. We have to regain what we lost and restore our position. After all, people left our country and went to live there. There is no need to reject them.

[Levin] Yes.

[Bovin] We have to work with them; we have to work with them. Some may wish to return. Others may only want to pay a visit. We also have to show concern for these people.

[Levin] In this respect I want to mention an episode that seems very typical to me. Boris Dmitriyevich Pankin made a very short trip—a ridiculously short trip, I am very sorry to say—around the old city. We met several groups of people who addressed him in Russian. They greeted him and wished him success and so on. It was obvious that these were people who had arrived from the Soviet Union relatively recently.

A woman in one of these groups said: Mr. Pankin, we are former compatriots of yours. Our minister's reaction was very interesting. Why former?, he asked. You have the right to remain Soviet citizens now. On 1 July we granted people emigrating to Israel the right to retain their Soviet citizenship. This was a very wise move.

[Bovin] That is exactly what I want to talk about. The important thing to bear in mind at this juncture is not that we are not being seen or heard there, as some are saying, but that our policy is becoming qualitatively different. The Arabs will, of course, resent what we have done. They have already taken offense, claiming that we are abandoning...

[Levin, interrupting] Nevertheless, they do somehow understand what we have done. On the whole they understand our action.

[Bovin] Well, they may understand, but emotions are once again at work.

[Levin] Yes.

[Bovin] Yes. So there will unquestionably be a period of cool. Then everything will even itself out and return to normal. We will have relations with both sets of people. The same applies to our compatriots there. Everything will fall into place and we will play the role we want to play there, but only to the extent—and I want to reemphasize this—that this meets the interests of our state. That should always be our yardstick. Our yardstick should never be ideology or goodness knows what other considerations of a philosophical nature there may be.

What interests do we have in Mozambique? What interests do we have in the Mongolians? What interests do we have in Guinea-Bissau or any other similar places? We have to define clearly those places where our state interests are at stake. Our state interests are at stake in Israel and we have to be there. That is all there is to it.

[Levin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, we have very little time left, but we have hardly touched on Gorbachev's meetings with Bush and Mitterrand.

[Bovin] Well, God will forgive us.

[Levin] God will forgive us, but I am not sure our listeners will. I think we ought to make an assessment of those meetings, if only a short one. I do not think the meeting with Bush departed to any great extent from the beaten path of Soviet-U.S. relations. The meeting with Mitterrand, on the other hand, made a greater impression on me, because France has been somewhat more reserved toward us. Our relationship with France has not been the same as the one with the United States. There has been a great deal of talk about Franco-Soviet relations. But Mitterrand has now moved from words to deeds. In current circumstances, that loan of 8 billion francs which we have been promised makes a very strong impression, since I know that France has quite a few domestic problems of its own. And...

[Bovin, interrupting] Incidentally, that is a question of our authority. That means that everything is not so tragic, that we have not disintegrated totally and that we are respected.

[Levin] And of our president too.

[Bovin] They want to help us, you realize that, they really want to help us. Although it is all very natural in the sense that in helping us they are also helping themselves.

[Levin] Of course.

[Bovin] But that is another issue. But they really do want to help us.

[Levin] They do not want there to be chaos in our country.

[Bovin] Yes. So Mitterrand is an experienced enough politician. He understands all of that and he stresses that; all the rest proceeds naturally from that. I am convinced that if Gorbachev were to meet with other leaders of Europe now, on the whole it would be the same; it would be the same. People realize that the more smoothly the period of transformation goes in our country, the more it will continue. All the same, nobody wants explosions, but everybody wants gradual steps, more or less equal. And Western aid is needed for that, of course, not just in the sense of parcels—that is needed also, of course—but people should come, they should invest considerable

capital simply in building enterprises. If the conditions are created to encourage this, it will draw us into the modern world economy.

[Levin] Summing up, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, I think that if you and affirm our thoughts that, realizing the inevitability of those processes—those destructive processes which are taking place in our country—we should nevertheless express the hope that this process will not be one of complete destruction. It would be advisable...

[Bovin, interrupting] You realize...

[Levin, interrupting] You realize that the situation is very, very complex, but I think that—I am already trying to sum up some of the results of our conversation—the events of the past week, the international events—first, Madrid, Gorbachev's meetings with Bush and Mitterrand—show once again that we do have authority and that it would be very sad if we, under the influence of emotions, were to continue the process of destroying that authority. And that also exists and that...

[Bovin, interrupting] Such a danger exists.

[Levin] ...cannot but alarm us. In destroying, we must realize to break something is not to build it. We must not think that it will not hurt our hearts; no, our hearts are very, very hurt.

For many years we have usually tried to end our program on some kind of optimistic note; I think that it would not be inappropriate to do so now. If, as a result of our conversation, our listeners will think things over and come to some kind of conclusion themselves, then we will have achieved our aim. Thank you, esteemed comrades, for your attention! You have been listening to the International Review program. Taking part in it were Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, political observer for the IZVESTIYA newspaper, and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, observer for All-Union Radio. Goodbye!

IZVESTIYA on G-7 Delegation's Visit

PM0111140191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[M. Yusin article followed by interview with economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy by I. Demchenko; place and date not given: "What the 'G-7' Delegation Is Bringing to Moscow"]

[Text] A representative delegation made up of the deputy finance ministers of the world's seven most industrially developed countries—the United States, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain, and Canada—arrives in the Soviet capital today for a two-day visit.

As of the time this issue of the newspaper was signed to press, the final program had still not been defined. For reasons we cannot fathom, the USSR Foreign Ministry Administration for International Economic Organizations actually refused to give IZVESTIYA any information on the delegation's composition or the preliminary program. Fortunately, the G-7 countries' Moscow embassies were not suffering from a mania for secrecy. They told us that during the trip it is planned that the delegation will meet with the finance ministers and leaders of the republic (possibly all 12) and Union central banks, and also with the country's leading economists, first and foremost Grigoriy Yavlinskiy.

The delegation's trip begins a little over a week after the annual joint IMF and World Bank session ended in Bangkok. The central theme of the meeting's agenda was the economic situation in the Soviet Union and the possibility of providing effective foreign aid to our country. It was in the Thai capital that the idea of sending a special G-7 delegation to Moscow was mooted.

The visit was prepared extremely swiftly. The West understands that now that the former Union's economy is collapsing before our very eyes and a terrifying winter lies ahead, every day is precious.

Commenting on the upcoming visit, the Western press notes that the dates for holding it were extremely well chosen. Only a few weeks ago, such a trip would have been pointless: Complete economic and political confusion reigned in the country. After the signing of the Treaty on the Economic Community 18 October, the outlines of the future Union emerged.

In addition, the basic guidelines for the economic reform that is in preparation have emerged. After a somewhat protracted pause, Yeltsin has apparently opted finally in favor of radical economic reform. And he was followed by Gorbachev, who at the opening of the Supreme Soviet session delivered a speech supporting resolute steps toward the market. In the West the Soviet leaders' pronouncements were received with enthusiasm. Now it is a matter of a specific program of transformations. But this cannot be compiled without taking account of Western aid.

One of the delegation's tasks is to resolve the argument which arose in Bangkok between the Americans and Japanese on the one hand and the Europeans on the other. Washington, supported by Tokyo, suggested rescheduling the Soviet Union's foreign debt payments for a few months, which would allow Moscow to use additional funds to purchase the foodstuffs so vital on the threshold of a hard winter. The Europeans opposed the idea. In their view, if the U.S. proposal is adopted, the USSR's prestige on the international money market will be undermined: Creditors will doubt Moscow's ability to pay, which will lead to a fall in capital investments in the Soviet economy. The G-7 did not reach consensus in Bangkok, and the delegation which is coming to Moscow will have to examine this complex issue.

Significant space in the foreign media commentaries has been devoted to the forthcoming talks between the G-7

envoys and the leaders of the economic departments of the former union republics. British newspapers predict that the West will adopt a tough stance with regard to republics which refuse to sign the agreement on the economic community, thus dropping out of the single economic space. It is primarily the Ukraine that is meant. THE GUARDIAN writes: "If Kiev plans to go it alone, it cannot count on Western support." The G-7 intend to pressure the Ukrainian leadership. So far it is not clear which will count for more: considerations of the economic advantage which the republic can derive if it is given Western aid, or the logic of the election battle, which demands that the Ukrainian president adopt a tough position vis-a-vis Moscow.

On the eve of the visit the Japanese press is expressing cautious optimism: MAINICHI notes that Japanese trade circles see the Treaty on the Economic Community as "the first step toward overcoming the current chaos" in the Soviet economy. However, the prospects for large-scale aid remain uncertain. The main reason is the failure to settle the territorial problem.

So far U.S. intentions are also uncertain. Recent encouraging statements by President Bush that the United States will not permit a famine in the Soviet Union this winter were not confirmed by specific plans. Maybe we will learn about some of these plans during the G-7 delegation's visit to Moscow.

Here is what Grigoriy Yavlinskiy said about this:

The problem of servicing the Soviet foreign debt because of the disintegration of the Soviet Union is the direct reason for the trip by the representatives of the heads of the "Big Seven" states. Naturally, this causes some concern among our creditors. During the Moscow meeting a series of consultations with leaders of sovereign states will be held in order to clarify their position on this question and to coordinate it with the interests of Western countries. At the same time, this meeting will be an opportunity to discuss a wide spectrum of questions on economic cooperation between the G-7 countries, international economic organizations, and former Union republics. Finally, they want to see what is happening in our country with their own eyes, and to get a sense of how serious our reform intentions are and what support we will need. I hope this will be a very blunt and honest discussion. Otherwise it is simply pointless....

[Demchenko] How high-level is this meeting?

[Yavlinskiy] The people who are coming to our country are extremely influential in international economic organizations and are close to the G-7 heads of state—the slang term for them is "sherpas." Our country already has the habit of calling meetings among the "Big Seven" heads of state summits. In the Himalayas sherpa is the name given to guides who accompany mountain climbers to the peaks. So it is no exaggeration to say that these people are very highly trusted, and their opinion will be of decisive significance for our future relations with the West.

United States & Canada

Navy Chief's Visit to U.S. Reported

OW0411125391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1140 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Admiral Vladimir Chernavin, who is the commander-in-chief of the Soviet Navy, has arrived in the U.S. for an official visit which will last till November 16. Earlier, the USSR had been visited by former chief of staff of the U.S. Navy, Admiral Trost.

Mr. Chernavin vill visit military installations, bases, military colleges, an aircraft carrier and a nuclear submarine. He will meet with chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell; with chief of staff of the U.S. Navy, Admiral Kelso, and with statesmen and politicians. The Soviet guest will address the students and lecturers of the Newport Naval College.

Mr. Chernavin told IF [INTERFAX] that he was pleased with his meetings with the American colleagues. Speaking about progress at the talks on naval forces, he said that so far the talks dealt with individual aspects of the naval forces and not with these forces as a whole which would have been more correct.

Over the past three years, the Soviet Navy has been reduced by 200 warships. "We would like our Navy to be less numerous, but younger, and more maneuverable and up-to-date," said Vladimir Chernavin.

U.S. Defense Official on Roundtable Talks

LD0211185691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] During 1992, 70 percent of defense enterprises will transfer to Russian jurisdiction, stated Mikhail Ananyan, president of the International Conversion Fund. He also said that the fund would allocate 1 billion rubles for the organization next year of orders at defense industry enterprises. Ananyan stated at a news conference that the committee of independent experts attached to the conversion fund had on 29 October passed a scheme of defense sufficiency to Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, USSR minister of defense; Aleksandr Rutskoy, vice president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]; and General Konstantin Kobets, chairman of the military reform committee of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Donald Atwood, deputy U.S. defense secretary, has described the dialogue that took place during a Soviet-U.S. roundtable on the problems of conversion in the USSR as most useful. His meeting with leaders of a

number of major defense enterprises and representatives of the Soviet military department took place in the Oktyabrskaya hotel. Direct contacts between industrialists to reorganize cooperation in a sphere as important as conversion are simply vital, said the deputy U.S. defense secretary.

Soviet-U.S. University Opens in Moscow

LD0211193491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1708 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Viktor Runov]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)—The Soviet-U.S. International University, which was set up in accordance with agreements between the presidents of the United States, the USSR, and Russia, opened in Moscow today. The ceremony was attended by prominent Soviet and U.S. public figures, including Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, and Robert Strauss, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, who gave a welcoming address. On behalf of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, a message of greetings and wishes of success to the Soviet-U.S. International University was read by Aleksandr Yakovlev.

The university is opening at a time of radical changes in the life of our country, says a message from Russian President Boris Yeltsin to the organizers of the educational institution. The national economy, he points out, needs specialists of a wholly new type, capable of finding their bearings in the strategems of the market economy. The university will train specialists in the sphere of business, finance, law, and sociology from among citizens from all the sovereign republics and from foreign states. Its diplomas will be recognized in Western Europe and the United States.

As the university's president, Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov declared, entrance examinations will start as early as January; these will be held by lecturers of leading U.S. higher education institutions, and in February about 500 students will embark on a four-year course.

China

PRC President's Views on Relations Noted

OW0211074691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1100 GMT 30 Oct 91

["Current Affairs and Commentaries" report by station commentator Belov]

[Text] It should be pointed out that both Moscow and Beijing once declared their loyalty to the principles of peaceful coexistence as early as in the 1950's and also after the 1950's. But because everything was carried on the basis of strict ideology, in fact these principles were not embodied in policies, and sometimes they went against these principles. This situation would sooner or later lead the relations between the two countries into a blind alley. Later, this actually occurred. This was a misfortune, of course. But after all it is our experience. Both Moscow and Beijing have learned a lesson. Soviet-Chinese relations have been normalized since the summit in 1989. The situation has further improved since the second summit of this year. What is most important is that the basis for normalization of relations is no longer ideology, but these principles—noninterference in each other's internal affairs, complete equality, mutual respect, and cooperation for mutual benefit are all embodied by the concept of the policy of peaceful coexistence. This basis is a firm one.

Chinese President Yang Shangkun has said that he believes that if the Soviet Union and China abide by the Soviet-Sino joint communiques of 1989 and 1991, relations between China and the Soviet Union will develop steadily and healthily. The Soviet Union, including the most prestigious personages, totally agrees with the confidence expressed by the Chinese side. Some articles have appeared in the press of the West and Asia. It seems that the authors of these articles have failed to understand that a new chapter has been opened for Sino-Soviet relations. It is impossible for relations to return to a former stage. Instead of linking relations between the two countries with the national interests of the peoples of the two countries, these authors linked them with the domestic incidents of the two countries. After the failure of the August rebellion in the Soviet Union, these authors predicted that relations between the Soviet Union and China may be suspended. But their predictions were wrong.

In his talk with Iranian reporters, Yang Shangkun stressed that the choice for the road of development to be followed by a country should be made by the people of that country. Other countries should not interfere with their choice. The Chinese leader expressed the hope that the central government of the Soviet Union and all its republics will work together to ensure stability and economic development.

Growing Economic Ties With Taiwan Viewed

PM0111165991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 91 Union Edition p 3

[By special correspondent S. Agafonov: "To Taiwan for Money... The New Itineraries of Soviet Businessmen"]

[Text] Taipei—Only quite recently Taiwan was for our countrymen confined to the image of a "political phantom" existing God knows how at the ends of the earth. Nowadays many people know how, and Taiwan has passed firmly from the sphere of political mythology into the category of serious economic realities we both wish and need to join.

Knowing through our own experience how capricious economic fortune is, we simply cannot now ignore a country that, though modest in size and devoid of resources, has made a fantastic upsurge in recent decades toward wealth and prosperity. Today Taiwan occupies

14th place in the world according to its volume of trade turnover and is on the second line in the graph of holders of hard currency reserves, securing for its citizens an income of more than $8,000 per capita.

The initial contacts with Taiwan business in third countries via the mediation of foreign firms and with all sorts of clandestine contrivances were not and could not be a base from which bilateral economic relations could begin sound development. For this to happen, serious changes in the world situation and the review of outdated dogmas in both Moscow and Taipei were required. Today the pace of the development of bilateral "direct exchanges" has markedly increased. Dozens of Soviet delegations of various calibers have visited Taiwan in recent months, as have journalists and businessmen from the widest "sector range"—from fishermen and foresters to leaders of the jewelry industry. The first records have been set in our young bilateral trade; for example, a substantial barter deal worth $200 million with Irkutsk Oblast for deliveries of consumer goods in exchange for aluminum, oil, timber, and other raw materials. Such an impressive debut did not so much surprise entrepreneurs as it did kindle interest in the Soviet market among Taiwan business people. Moreover, incidentally, they are not throwing up their hands in despair in Taipei when they see the Soviet economy in a period of disintegration—businessmen here are convinced that a mutually advantageous solution can be found in any situation, if the desire exists.

That such a desire does exist is attested by the figures: In 1988 bilateral turnover via third countries and intermediaries amounted to only $40 million, whereas this year it will reach $200 million. In the future, it will double at the very least (the aforementioned Irkutsk barter deal will feature in next year's statistics). In March 1990 the Taiwan Government officially lifted the ban on direct trade contacts with the USSR that had been in existence for several decades.

It was stated in Taipei in July that Taiwan is ready to grant financial aid to the USSR for economic development needs, and the amount of the first potential credit "payment" was named: $20 million. Finally, last week the government stated its readiness to finance not only the center but the republics as well. These are extremely serious intentions, as you can judge, and reinforced by an additional fact—an appeal to the Soviet authorities from the local Chinese Association for Foreign Trade Development to allow this nongovernmental organization to open a mission in Moscow.

In the opinion of Minister of Economic Affairs Vincent Siew, the Soviet Union may become Taiwan's principal trading partner in Eastern Europe in the near future, and Mr. Huang, deputy chairman of the Chinese Association for Foreign Trade Development, firmly believes that a positive answer to the request to open a mission can be expected virtually within days, which will enable full-blooded work to begin as early as the beginning of 1992, to the benefit of both partners.

It would be very undesirable for this sincere optimism to be drowned yet again in our bureaucratic mires, which are still a danger. There are hopes that this will not happen, as indicated above all by the visit to Taiwan of a representative delegation of Soviet bankers headed by USSR State Bank Chairman Viktor Gerashchenko. The Taiwan Ministry of Foreign Trade explained that quite an intensive program has been put together for the delegation, including detailed talks with Taiwan businessmen concerning development prospects for bilateral trade, economic, and financial relations. It is worth noting that banking contacts are by no means virgin territory for the partners—this year direct links between three Taiwan banks and Soviet financial institutions have already been established, so V. Geraschenko's business trip to Taipei is a sort of continuation of the dialogue via a "visit to the spot."

Bankers are serious people, and let us hope that both sides will be satisfied with their mutual acquaintance. The payoff from this may have beneficial effects in the very near future.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Envoy Discusses Territorial Issue

LD0311185891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1515 GMT 3 Nov 91

["International Panorama" interview with Sumio Edamura, Japanese ambassador to USSR, by announcer Aleksandr Drozdov; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Drozdov] Mr. Ambassador, with whom is Japan going to conduct talks on economic and political problems, including controversial ones, with Russia or with the center in the person of Gorbachev?

[Edamura] After the August coup, it was the leadership of the Russian Federation that gave us a positive response regarding the improvement of bilateral relations, and it was the Russian leadership that expressed the view that the territorial issue should be solved, on the basis of international law and the principles of justice and legality.

In mid-October, at the meeting between Mr. Pankin and Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama, what was discussed was the so-called parallel talks with the Soviet Union and with Russia—in other words, the readiness of the Soviet Union and Russia to go into talks with Japan, especially talks on concluding a peace treaty, with a single and well-regulated approach. So, we are not worried about the question of whom to do business with, the Union or with Russia.

[Drozdov] One hears the word deal often in the terminology used both here and in Japan with regard to the territorial problem. Do you agree that deal conveys most

precisely the sense of a possible solution to the territorial issue, or should the formula rather envisage something more than that?

[Edamura] You, no doubt, mean a deal on solving the territorial issue and economic cooperation with Japan? I do not think there will be any deal here. As you will understand, economic relations cannot last long if they are not mutually advantageous. It is not just Japan that demands the settling of the territorial issue and the conclusion of a peace treaty. The Soviet leadership acknowledges the great loss the absence of a peace treaty causes your country. Because both aspects will bring mutual benefit to our countries, we now agree that these aspects should be advanced simultaneously. Without a peace treaty between our countries, however, complete mutual trust is lacking. Such an unnatural situation, of course, has an influence on the long-term approach to your country by Japanese business circles, including in the area of capital investment in the development of the Far East and Siberia and in the establishment of an infrastructure in this region.

The Japanese private sector is very active and strong, and the whole Japanese people will vigorosly demonstrate their readiness to advance Japan's relations with the Soviet Union and Russia. So, I would like to stress the need to eradicate this unnatural situation, namely the absence of a peace treaty between neighboring countries.

[Drozdov] Is the Japanese side aware that public opinion has appeared in our country, something we never had before, and that it is against returning the Kuril Islands to Japan. What do you think about this?

[Edamura] Unfortunately, there was an era when totalitarianism ruled in your country; therefore, there was no opportunity to develop sensible public opinion with regard to Japan. But the situation has changed now, and I am very glad that I am able to hold a dialogue with Soviet people freely in this way. On the territorial issues, however, people simply do not have sufficient knowledge about them, and perhaps they have had distorted information about this issue.

I would like Soviet citizens to understand that the starting point is—and Mr. Kozyrev, the Russian foreign minister, has spoken of this starting point—that there are no juridically established state borders between Japan and the USSR. That means that the existing arrangement has in practice not been confirmed from the point of view of international law. Today, the arrangement as it was after the post-war occupation of the islands is simply being continued, and our common aim is to settle this matter juridically as soon as possible.

I would like to point out one elementary fact. These islands never belonged to any other country but Japan. In 1855, Japan and the Russian Empire, without any outside pressure, peacefully determined the state border existing at that time. We hope that the importance of this historic precedent will be taken into account. I appeal to your country's public opinion to trust the governments of our countries and observe with understanding the efforts of both governments being undertaken toward the just settlement of this issue.

Japanese Ruling on Kuril Visits Viewed

PM0411115191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Nov 91 Union Edition p 5

[By correspondent S. Agafonov: "Who Is on Lists"]

[Text] Tokyo—On 29 October a session of the Japanese Council of Ministers adopted a seemingly modest document to which, however, a special briefing was devoted at the Foreign Ministry here. In form, this document is a government instruction or resolution, lending specific form to the Soviet-Japanese agreement on setting up regular visa-free visits between Japanese citizens and inhabitants of the Soviet South Kuril Islands.

The idea was examined and agreed upon during the April visit to Japan by the USSR president and was then worked out in detail during numerous meetings and discussions through diplomatic channels. It finally received the definitive "go-ahead" in October after the exchange of letters between the Japanese foreign minister and his counterpart from Smolensk Square. Yesterday, the Japanese Government "decoded" its concept of "visa-free measures," which required commentaries from reliable representatives of the Foreign Ministry.

It was explained to journalists that the Japanese side has agreed to organize visa-free visits to the Northern Territories, guided by the sincere desire "to promote the matter of bilateral mutual understanding and dialogue" and the hope to use this new form of communication to accelerate the solution of the territorial question between the two countries.

It was this question which in the past prevented the possibility of "promoting the matter"—Japan, considering the islands to be illegally occupied, did not allow its citizens to go to the South Kurils with passports and visas; the Soviets would not allow them inside their borders without visas and passports. Now, in fact, this deadlock has been overcome by joint efforts, so that the doors would seem to be wide open for this dialogue and mutual understanding. We have scaled new heights, as the saying goes. It is still premature, however, to sound a cheerful note on this subject because the Japanese cabinet's explanations give rise to questions.

According to the Japanese position coordinated with the Soviet side, visits will be by groups within stipulated dates and with the necessary documents (identity cards and special papers) but without passports and visas. That is understandable and does not require commentary. The groups will be accompanied by representatives of the central and local organs of power for liaison and contact with the host side. That is also clear. The program defining the details of each trip, including the places to be visited, the composition of the groups, the itinerary, and the dates and means of transport will be

approved during diplomatic consultations between bodies of the two sides, taking into account the delicate nature of the measure. However, there then follows a text that has not been coordinated between the sides and that has been formulated by the Japanese themselves.

Point five of the Japanese document regulating visa-free visits reads that the composition of the Japanese groups sent to the South Kurils should be according to three categories of participants: former inhabitants of these islands (according to Japanese calculations there are now about 10,000 of them left), representatives of the press, and people involved in the movement demanding the return of Japan's Northern Territories. The latter category is a very piquant one, because visa-free "official trips" by activists of the "movement for the return of the Northern Territories" are hard to interpret as anything but a kind of propagandist "assault landing" and the transfer of discussions on the ownership of the islands to the islands themselves.

Of course, the official interpretation of this category of "those admitted for visits" looks different and emphasizes the delicate nature of the "problem" and the desire to avoid incidents and a general "unconditional friendliness" among the movement's members. That is wonderful, but it is nonetheless difficult to understand why, out of all the Japanese, the Foreign Ministry lists should include only those who are "aware of" and "informed about" the territorial issue. One may grant that Tokyo has decided to form the visit groups on the basis of this principle, but why then is the matter being advertized so and to what purpose?

It is well known how painful the problem of the islands has become recently and what keen debates it is generating within our country. We are not alone in knowing this. The Japanese know it just as well, so that in preparing this document and choosing the date to make it public it is hardly likely that a "miscalculation" was allowed through an oversight. Given the Japanese precision and scrupulousness, it is simply impossible to believe it, especially because, as the Japanese themselves admit, several months were taken to select the above-mentioned "formulations of categories of individuals."

Consequently, the compulsory inclusion of "members of the movement" in the government instruction was specially conceived and presented in the explanations for the press. You do not have to guess what the reaction to this "fifth point" may be. We will probably receive a whole "bouquet" of protests and another "cold shower" for bilateral relations. Somehow one does not want to accuse the Japanese side of premeditation, but you cannot find other interpretations for the explanations for the "visa-free initiatives."

And one more important element. As was repeatedly stressed at the Moscow briefing, the decision on visa-free exchanges has nothing to do with the development of business and economic ties between Japan and the South Kurils—the actual ban on this remains in force, and Tokyo intends to keep careful track of its observance. That is why we should not expect businessmen to visit using the special papers. Other people, "involved in the movement for the return of the Northern Territories," will visit the islands in their place...

To all appearances, the first Japanese group consisting of these three categories will visit the Kuril shores next spring. So we must expect the guests. Based on the lists....

ROK-U.S. Military Exercise Analyzed

SK0311113691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1100 GMT 1 Nov 91

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Military representatives of the ROK and the United States have announced they will conduct a military exercise codenamed "Foal Eagle" from 1 November through 8 November this year.

KRAZNAYA ZVEZDA military commentator Aleksandr Golts writes:

I wondered if a piece of old news accidentally reached us because of a computer malfunction when I heard about the exercise. It was not the result of a computer malfunction, however, but a decision made by the two countries' military leaders.

About 39,000 U.S. troops, ROK soldiers, and about 2 million homeland reserve forces are to participate in this military exercise. This is a military measure [chochi] taken precisely at a time when there is a sign of detente in the situation on the Korean peninsula.

The premier-level talks between Seoul and Pyongyang have just ended, more satisfactorily than expected. The two sides have not only expressed satisfaction over the procedures of the talks but also agreed to work out an accord on nonaggression, reconciliation, cooperation, and exchanges.

Timed to coincide with this, Washington has formally announced a plan to withdraw all nuclear weapons from the ROK next year. It was expected to begin a phased reduction of U.S. troops stationed in the ROK.

What does this decision, which is a show of force in the spirit of the past era, envision? According to ASSOCIATED PRESS, the just-announced military exercise is seen as one way to put pressure on Pyongyang.

The DPRK has stated that it will agree to inspections of the nuclear facilities built on its territory by the International Atomic Energy Agency only when the U.S. military bases are placed under inspection. The West is convinced that the DPRK is now in the process of developing nuclear weapons on its own.

I am not going to discuss how justified the North Korean side's insistence is. Nevertheless, pressure and blackmail will only generate more mutual suspicion and isolation.

In my opinion, the apprehension felt by a certain ROK sector about the speedy reduction of the U.S. troops stationed there may be the motive behind the military exercise.

Such misgivings are associated with the traditional fear of a southward invasion. Washington, too, has reason to be interested in such a military exercise.

Let us quote SEGYE TIMES, a paper published in Seoul. The daily said that the withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons could be carried out under the (?banner) of a joint military exercise scheduled to be held in the spring of 1992.

The two countries may have decided to conduct the current military exercise as part of preparations for future military exercises. This military exercise, however, will not help to promote security and confidence on the Korean peninsula.

Trade, Cooperation With ROK Increasing

LD0411081891 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Text] Moscow November 4 TASS—"There is every indication that the days of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea have receded into the past. Having got rid of the cold-war stereotypes, the two countries have at last made steps towards each other," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev told DELOVYE LYUDI (BUSINESS IN THE USSR) journal.

"Three summit meetings took place within less than a year and a Moscow declaration on general principles of inter-state relations has been signed. The declaration has been viewed in the world as a major contribution to asserting new norms of inter-state relations in the Asia-Pacific region," Rogachev said.

"A series of important intergovernmental agreements—on trade, the protection of investments, scientific and technical cooperation, etc. —has been concluded.

"Trade and economic cooperation develops at a rapid pace. Over the past four years, goods turnover has been doubling every year to amount to about 900 million dollars last year. The Soviet Union has been granted credits worth three billion dollars.

"During their latest meeting Mikhail Gorbachev and No Tae-u touched upon matters aimed at reducing military activities in the region, cutting down arms and preventing nuclear confrontation on the Korean peninsula," Rogachev said.

'Progress' Noted in Inter-Korean Talks

PM0111161591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 91 Union Edition p 3

[By V. Ganshin: "Pyongyang and Seoul Seeking Accord"]

[Text] South Korean Premier Chon Won-sik has returned to Seoul after a series of intensive talks in Pyongyang, where the latest meeting—the fourth in all—between the heads of the North and South governments has been taking place within the framework of the inter-Korean dialogue. Observers note that this time the results of his conversations and discussions with his northern colleagues can be considered more fruitful than previously.

I will remind you that the main contradiction between the sides was the difference in their approaches toward the priority of the tasks they face to normalize their relations. The DPRK considers the main priority to be a settlement in the military-political sphere, whereas South Korea stresses the humanitarian aspects of bilateral relations.

Although each side stuck to its own opinion on this issue, the decision to sign a nonaggression pact at the next meeting (due to be held in Seoul 10-13 December) can be considered a positive point.

Observers believe that the degree of progress at the talks stemmed from a number of factors: In South Korea, general parliamentary elections are less than six months away, and the DPRK is committed to extending its international and economic relations. Skeptics, it is true, believe that the settlement process may again become deadlocked over the dispute that has recently flared up about North Korean nuclear installations. In 1985 Pyongyang signed the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, but it is refusing to be a party to the concomitant agreement on international guarantees, which presupposes inspection of nuclear installations by the International Atomic Energy Agency. At the same time, the DPRK is demanding the total withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea and the transformation of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. The only encouraging sign is the fact that the sides agreed to continue the discussion of this question outside the framework of the prime ministers' talks.

Expedition Resumes Filming of KAL Site

92UF0122A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[By special correspondent Sergey Taranov, on board the ship Gidronavt in Tatarskiy Proliv: "IZVESTIYA Camera Documents the Tragedy"]

[Text] **After an enforced idleness caused by inclement weather, the IZVESTIYA expedition resumed its work on the South Korean Boeing's crash site in Tatarskiy Proliv, and with that, the filming of the documentary on the KAL-007 tragedy.**

In order to use the time efficiently, different tactics were used. It was decided that during the time Tinro-2 needed to recharge batteries between submersions, its partner, remote control minirover-200, would be sent underwater. This robot, which amazes even experienced

hydronauts, deserves a special word. Before the commencement of the IZVESTIYA expedition, the only place it had been tested by its custodians, researchers Sergey Vasilyev and Vilyam Muravyev of the All-Union Research Institute for Sea Fishing and Oceanography, was the swimming pool in Luzhniki. It was made in the United States from a special plastic that can withstand the pressure of several dozen atmospheres. The recorded images are of very high resolution. In essence, it is a technological breakthrough that makes the use of cumbersome, expensive, and manned craft not always safe for humans unnecessary. In a way, the robot obviates the profession of hydronaut. But technology is technology: Even this wonderful apparatus had a glitch. A defect in the head joint to which the remote control cable connects (the fault of the U.S. company Bentos) had required serious efforts to fix.

Now the chronology of the day.

0830: Arrived at the designated area. The buoy dropped in the water two days earlier is found, but it had drifted almost a mile.

1000: Tinro-2 is lowered into water. In it, there are its permanent crewman Mikhail Girs and, for the first time, our cameraman Vladimir Kolyushev with a camera.

1030: Tinro-2 submersion point is not the best. It is four cable's lengths (650 meters) away from the point where the search ended on 22 October. The visibility, however, is excellent—20 meters.

1043: The apparatus is moving with great difficulty—the current is pushing it off course.

1055: A rag with some wires came briefly into view. It is almost certainly from the Boeing, but there is no hope for anything more serious. Tinro is now entirely off course and ended up at a depth of 182 meters. The aircraft debris is somewhere to the side. The depth there is 172 to 178 meters.

1203: Finally! Girs could not even believe his own eyes at first. It seems that an engine is located. There is silence on the bridge. Three minutes later a voice from below: "Yes, it is a piece of a turbine, about 75 by 50 centimeters. No housing. Everything is smashed by an explosion. Pinions, wires, and many, many ropes. As if someone had tried to lift the turbine." Yuriy Sidorenko says that most likely the turbine had been dragged here by the military who eight years ago had been trawling for the aircraft.

1220: The report from Tinro-2 is that aircraft debris is everywhere. The cameraman can keep the camera rolling. Tinro-2 has to surface faster than usual, however. Because of the three-hour-long struggle with the current, the batteries were discharged...

Girs would later say that he was going up practically without any power, without any operational controls for the first time in 20 years. Well, just one more unexpected thing. Probably not the last.

...A question that is of interest to many. Still, where are the remains of the passengers? Why have they not been found? Before the expedition took to sea in Nevelsk, I heard this version from sailors: The body parts found in 1983—torn off arms, legs, fingers—had been actually collected from morgues and put on the doomed aircraft by the Americans. There were never any passengers, they said.

This is nonsense, of course. Now it is clear: If superstrong alloys of the aircraft body got smashed into small pieces, what can one say about people. They were probably smashed into small pieces and dispersed. The crabs finished the job....

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Opposition Visit to Moscow Postponed

OW0111180191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1537 GMT 1 Nov 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The visit to Moscow of a mujahidin delegation led by the leader of the Islamic Society of Afghanistan, Burhanuddin Rabbani, scheduled to the first days of November, will not take place earlier than November 10. The USSR Foreign Ministry which maintains contacts with the mujahidin leaders through its representatives in Islamabad, has information suggesting that Mr. Rabbani has not yet coordinated his positions with the part of the Afghan opposition based in Iran.

A high-ranking Soviet diplomat told DP [Diplomatic Panorama] that Moscow had sent an invitation to the talks to all of the mujahidin leaders and hoped that the delegation would represent "the widest possible spectrum of the Afghan opposition". Judging by the signals coming through the Pakistani side, among those who will come to Moscow for talks will be a representatives of the grouping led by Gulbuddin Hiqmatyar who is known for his irreconcilable ways.

The USSR Foreign Ministry has confirmed that among the cardinal issue at the talks will be the release of POWs. Moscow will raise the question of releasing the POWs of both sides. According to reliable sources, Najibollah had agreed to exchange the mujahidin POWs for Afghan and Soviet servicemen captured by the opposition. The Soviet diplomatic circles believe that for the beginning the sides should exchange the lists of the POWs and then pass over to exchanges, according to the quotas to be drafted.

According to authoritative sources, unlike the US which has already terminated arms supplies to the mujahidin, the USSR continues to send armaments to Kabul. "We stem from the fact that the Soviet-American agreements

on the termination of arms supplies to the Afghan conflicting parties go into effect on January 1," DP was told.

The mujahidin delegation may possibly arrive in the USSR on November 10 because on this particular day a Pakistani airliner will make a regular flight from Islamabad to Kabul with a technical stop-over in Moscow.

Afghanistan Signs Economic, Trade Protocol

LD0311174191 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 3 Nov 91

[By correspondent German Baykov]

[Text] Kabul November 3 TASS—Afghanistan and the Soviet Union signed a protocol on trade and economic cooperation in Kabul today. From the Soviet side, the protocol was signed by A.I. Kachanov, first deputy minister of foreign economic relations, and from the Afghan side - Minister of Planning Ghulam Muhayuddin Shahbaz. On the Soviet delegation are representatives of Russia and Tadjikistan.

Representatives of the USSR met Afghan President Najibollah and Prime Minister Fazl Haq Khaliqyar to discuss issues pertaining to the fulfillment of mutual obligations and prospects for bilateral ties.

At the talks it was stressed that as the Soviet Union was moving to effect sweeping reforms and Afghanistan was implementing the policy aimed at enhancing the role of the private sector, extending direct links between the Republic of Afghanistan and sovereign republics and developing mutually beneficial links between Afghan private firms and Soviet entrepreneurs were the most promising areas of trade and economic cooperation.

The sides paid particular attention to resuming Afghan gas supplies as a chief means of payment for wheat and fuel, which are vital to Afghanistan.

Iran's Nuclear Potential, PRC Ties Eyed

NC0311094591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Persian to Iran 1430 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] Dear listeners: PRC President Yang Shangkun's official three-day visit to Iran ended on 1 November. We invite you to listen to a commentary on this by our analyst Yuriy Andreyev.

Facts show that Yang Shangkun left Tehran in good spirits, since on the surface his visit to Tehran was calm. He held talks with President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, met with Iran's religious leader Ayatollah Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i, and spoke on Iranian television.

The official press release reports that the talks focused on international problems and that the two sides noted the full conformity of their stances.

Thus, everything appeared normal. Nevertheless, attention focused on this visit in many countries. On the eve of Yang Shangkun's visit to Tehran, world news agencies, citing the CIA, published reports on Iranian-Chinese nuclear cooperation. According to CIA reports, Iran is striving to produce nuclear weapons, and China has sold it installations to achieve such objectives.

Related to this, on the last day of Yang Shangkun's visit, the U.S. State Department took a serious diplomatic step when spokesman Joseph Schneider announced that the United States opposes any type of nuclear cooperation between Tehran and Beijing. He pointed out that despite Iran's assurances that its nuclear program is peaceful, the United States is very concerned that installations that can be used for two purposes can easily be changed to be used for military purposes.

Japan agreed with Washington, and Chief Cabinet Secretary Misoji Sakamoto told a news conference in Tokyo that Japan is concerned about possible Iranian-Chinese nuclear cooperation.

Meanwhile, official Iranian circles have categorically denied U.S. Government accusations. President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani described them as propaganda, but Vice President Ayatollah Mohajerani said in an ABRAR interview that, like Israel, Islamic countries have the right to nuclear weapons. He stated that a country's decision to have nuclear weapons in its arsenal should not hinge on international opinion. Meanwhile, Mohajerani practically confessed that Iran has all the necessary potential to produce nuclear weapons.

Thus, Iran's true nuclear program is not yet clear. Only time will tell.

Commentary on Middle East Role, Policies

LD0311170191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1700 2 Nov 91

[Commentary by Petr Dmitriyev: "Why is Israel's Right Wing Crying Over the Brezhnev-Gromyko Middle East Policies?"—read by announcer]

[Text] Yuval Ne'eman, Israeli minister of science, technology, energy, and infrastructure has asserted in Jerusalem: It is very regrettable that the Soviet Union has changed his policies in the Middle East in comparison with the 1970's.

This might appear, at first glance, a strange thing; Ne'eman is the chairman of the ultra-right-wing Tehiya Party, which has been calling for the annexation of all territories captured following the 1967 war.

The Tehiya Party's leadership has been opposing any moderate tendency shown by the Israeli Government. Ne'eman criticized, some time ago, Shamir's willingness to negotiate a compromise solution on land. He threatened, furthermore, that his party would withdraw from the right-wing alliance.

Suddenly, however, such a stalwart of the [idea] of greater Israel shows regrets over the end of the Soviet

policies practiced during the era of Brezhnev and Gromyko in the Middle East. However, one should not be astonished; Ne'eman has his own arguments: When the Soviet Union had a unilateral policy of supporting extremists in the Arab world, the United States used to see in Israel the only trustworthy supporter of the free world in the region and behaved as the situation warranted then. Therefore, it was impossible to exert any pressure to bear upon Israel to hand back land to Arabs.

Briefly, according to the logic of this Israeli personality, all the time when Moscow had a unilateral stance supporting Arab radicals in the Arab world, the radicals on the other side of the trench were the first beneficiaries of such policies. The American leadership was all that time influencing the Israeli leaders to harden their stance. Let us for example remember how tension heightened in the region following the signing of the treaty for strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, notwithstanding the fact that the treaty itself was a purely American initiative.

In support of the general Western line, it was planned to abandon the former Soviet policy supporting radical countries in the Third World. One should here agree with the well-known Soviet politician and commentator Tomas Kolesnichenko, that convening the Middle East peace conference would not have been possible without the change in Soviet policy.

The concern of Israel's ultra-right-wing forces is understandable, because ever since the end of the U.S.-Soviet confrontation the two superpowers do not obstruct each other but cooperate in the issue of reconciliation in the Middle East. This has disappointed [Israel's] ultra-right wing, for they used to assert that the territories of greater Israel, from the river to the sea, were dearer to them than peace.

It is more difficult, however, to understand radical Arabs who are repeating that they wanted just peace in the region and are at the same time responding with terrorist acts to all the efforts being exerted to give momentum to the peace process. It was no coincidence that the Soviet delegation to Madrid expressed its shock over the action of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine's in attacking an Israeli bus with civilians on board on the West Bank. Such acts are a blow to both the international efforts and to the stance of the Arab leadership, which was coordinated few days before the opening of the Madrid conference, and to Arab interests as well.

The formula of land for peace is doubtful, for if Arab radicals refuse to grant Israel peace, Israel will refuse to hand back the territories.

West Europe

German Bank Official Visits, Views Economy

Meets Gorbachev

LD0211184191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Sergey Petukhov]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev had a meeting in the Kremlin today with Hilmar Kopper, chairman of the board of the Deutsche Bank, Germany's largest financial association, and his party.

A TASS correspondent was told by Andrey Grachev, head of the presidential press service, that the Soviet leader informed them of the current acute stage in implementing economic reforms, which have entered the stage of practical implementation, and in carrying out radical measures, which have been under lively debate for a prolonged period of time in our society. On the agenda, Mikhail Gorbachev noted, is one of the most difficult transitions, connected with liberalizing prices, stabilizing the financial and monetary system, and implementing other measures to push the country forward in the direction of a market economy. These measures, of course, are fraught with the danger of social strains and social tension under the conditions that have emerged in our economy, especially the extensive monopolization in society. In this regard Mikhail Gorbachev noted the importance of all social forces making the necessary efforts for cooperation at this crucial period.

The USSR president reported that, as the results of his recent visit to Spain and France show, the leaders of the Soviet Union's partner countries are voicing anxiety over the uncertainty of the economic situation in the USSR. He voiced hope that the Soviet Union and its republics might be able to count on partnership in overcoming this difficult stage of the USSR's entry into the world economy.

Andrey Grachev said that the leaders of the Deutsche Bank, for their part, had given a positive assessment of the steps being taken in the USSR for transferring to the market. They drew attention to the need for consistent stages in this process. In their view, excessively rapid progress could in a number of cases create additional problems and difficulties for the population, although such overloads were natural for a period of such large-scale changes.

The representatives of the Deutsche Bank believe that the process of privatization in the USSR should begin with small and medium-sized enterprises. They also stressed the importance of preserving the unity of the USSR's responsibility regarding its previous debts and financial obligations toward other countries. An interruption or uncertainty in this field, they believe, could have the most serious consequences for the Soviet Union's subsequent reputation and its financial and economic links in the international arena.

The German financiers stated that Germany, which has until now been taking an active part in promoting economic reform in the Soviet Union, is counting on more active participation in this process by other Western powers. In all of the programs for aid to the

Soviet Union, about 80 percent falls on the European countries, while the United States and Japan are for the moment standing aside.

As a result of the meeting, Andrey Grachev said, an accord was reached that the participants in the Soviet-German working group would elaborate practical proposals concerning the participation of the financial circles of the FRG in resolving problems facing the Soviet economy at the current stage. But the German financiers stressed that what should be at issue is not so much increasing credits as linking them with a well-thought out, concrete long-term program of economic reforms.

Viktor Gerashchenko, Chairman of the USSR State Bank, and Vadim Medvedev took part in the meeting on the Soviet side.

Sums Up Talks

LD0211185191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1230 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)—"We have received confirmation of our evaluation of the situation in the USSR, and we are ready to continue cooperation with this country." This was how Hilmar Kopper, chairman of the board of Deutsche Bank, summed up the results of his trip to the Soviet Union while speaking at a news conference held today in the bank's offices in Moscow. He had meetings with leaders of Ukraine and Russia and was received today by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. The German financier said that attention during the talks was primarily focused on the prospects for financial policy and the liability of the new sovereign states as regards foreign indebtedness. "We have some approaches in common regarding this problem and also mutual understanding in the question of dividing liability between the republics," Hilmar Kopper stressed. At the same time, he made it clear that if the processes of disintegration in the Soviet Union get stronger, this could have an adverse effect upon the country's cooperation with financial establishments in the West.

The Deutsche Bank head voiced his opinion on the expediency of retaining a single currency in the USSR. He voiced concern regarding the country's ability to service its foreign debt in the future and admitted the possibility of introducing a moratorium on its repayment. But at present there are no deferments in the Soviet Union's servicing of its debt, according to him.

Hilmar Kopper described as "very useful" the exchange of opinions he had with Mikhail Gorbachev. According to the banker, they found mutual understanding regarding the nature of and timescale for transformations in the USSR.

Bank To Open Kiev Branch

OW0211214191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1730 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Saturday [2 November] Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin high-ranking officers of the Deutsche Bank—Hilmar Kopper and Georg Krupp who informed the Soviet president that their bank jointly with the USSR Gosbank and a Soviet-German working group had prepared a programme of help to Soviet reforms.

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed hope that the USSR and its sovereign republics can count on their partners in the process of integrating into the world economy.

On the same day H. Kopper and G. Krupp said to the press at their headquarters in Moscow that the Deutsche Bank intends to open a branch in Kiev next year.

Concerning the talks in Moscow H. Kopper paid particular attention to the prospects of servicing and repaying the Soviet external debt. The most this country can count on is some delay in paying the interest. If any attempt is made at freezing the debt, "Western bankers will shun this zone for decades and exclude it from the world economy".

H. Kopper expressed satisfaction over the recent signing by 8 republics of a memorandum on the principles of repaying the foreign debt. He said the reservations and claims made by some republics' leaders should not be overdramatized.

Meets Silayev, Notes Debt

LD0311090691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Interrepublican Economic Committee, and Hilmar Kopper, Deutsche Bank board chairman, spoke in favor of continuing cooperation between Soviet and German financial institutions during a meeting held this morning. The sides reached agreement on continuing cooperation between specialists from the USSR and Germany in carrying out an analysis of the Soviet Union's debt based on its state at the end of October. As you remember, at the recent meeting of representatives of the sovereign republics and deputy finance ministers of the G-7, the latter were given information on the state of liquidity. In order to retain the possibility of the USSR's essential payments until 10 November, $320 million needs to be paid, and if it waits until the end of the year, then it increases to $3.87 billion. This situation makes cooperation between the USSR and its Western partners absolutely essential.

Silayev, Germany's Moellemann on Economic Ties

LD0211190391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct (TASS)—Ivan Silayev, Interrepublican Economic Committee chairman, and FRG Economic Affairs Minister Juergen Moellemann, who came to Moscow on a one-day visit, expressed interest in the maintenance of further, intensive economic contacts between the USSR and the FRG during a meeting held here today.

The Economic Treaty signed recently by the republics has not only economic but also political significance, I. Silayev commented. We are not troubled by the fact that the document has so far been signed by only eight republics, he said. "I am sure that others will join, including the Ukraine." The leader of the committee emphasized that a significant number of treaties will be concluded between republics of the former Union before the end of this year. As I. Silayev noted, the problem of debt repayment is putting great pressure on the country during conditions when it is necessary to make considerable purchases of food, medicine, and consumer goods.

The USSR is seeking not only to return to the total volume of economic cooperation that the country had with the FRG and the GDR, but to conduct it according to new principles, I. Silayev added. In this regard, he said, the USSR and the republics are prepared to grant German entrepreneurs the most favorable business conditions and opportunities to make big profits. What we need most of all is to acquire modern technologies for the thorough processing of raw materials, oil, and agricultural produce. Investments by Western business circles in the production of consumer goods and in construction and health care will be especially welcome. In the next two weeks, he stated, the USSR will adopt a number of additional customs concessions or completely abolish duty on the import of food, medicine, and machine-building output for small farms.

According to Juergen Moellemann, the Economic Treaty is not only a stabilizing element for the participants themselves but also a basis for the continuation of Western aid to the USSR and its republics. The FRG intends not to reduce but to increase cooperation so as to make the process of reforms a successful one. FRG entrepreneurs, J. Moellemann pointed out, are interested in cooperation with the USSR and the Russian Federation in the field of oil refining. At the same time, FRG representatives expressed their desire to ensure stable supplies of Soviet oil and gas to the territory of former GDR. The sides agreed to set up a working group that would work out proposals concerning the future development of cooperation between the two countries.

Germany Still Seeks Honecker Extradition

LD0311115691 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 3 Nov 91

[By correspondent Nikolay Kalintsev]

[Text] Bonn November 3 TASS—The federal government intends once again to raise in earnest the question of extradition of former East German leader Erich Honecker to Germany before the Union and Russian authorities.

With this end in view, the German ambassador to the Soviet Union will be instructed to undertake all necessary actions, federal Justice Minister Klaus Kinkel said on Saturday [2 November] in an interview with the ZDF television programme.

The German representative will soon apply to appropriate Union and Russian authorities in a written and oral demand the extradition of Honecker to Germany where the former East German leader is to be brought before the law-court.

Kinkel refuted assertions that the German Government had not ostensibly applied to the Russian Federation's representatives on the issue. This problem, he said, has been repeatedly raised by Bonn politicians at both the Union and republican levels.

German Magazine 'Financed by KGB' for Years

LD0311061191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 1 Nov 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A meeting between representatives of the Russian Procuracy and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and journalists is opening in Moscow at this very moment. Perhaps one could expect fresh sensations, for example, about the leak on the State Committee for the State of Emergency case documents.

According to an INFORM-KURANTY report, Stepankov, Russian Procurator General, said yesterday that Kalugin, an ex-KGB general, believes that it was no accident that these documents found their way into DER SPIEGEL, the German magazine. He asserts that for 30 years the magazine was financed by the KGB.

General Grachev Ends Visit to Norway

LD0211094891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1628 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By correspondent Sergey Neshumov]

[Text] Oslo, 1 Nov (TASS)—Colonel General Pavel Grachev, USSR first deputy minister of defense, has today completed his official visit to Norway.

During his week there, the Soviet military commander and those accompanying him have become acquainted

with the life of the armed forces in Norway, with the organization and military training of the Norwegian Army, and with military bases and installations in various regions of Norway. P. Grachev also held meetings with Johan Jorgen Holst, the Norwegian minister of defense, and with Admiral Torolf Rein, commander in chief of the Norwegian Armed Forces.

P. Grachev told a TASS correspondent in an interview that the aim of his visit to Norway had been to acquaint himself with the armed forces and military doctrine of a neighboring country and to exchange views with Norwegian military leaders on issues of mutual interest. "The Soviet military delegation informed the Norwegians about changes and reforms in the USSR Armed Forces," he stated. "This information will be passed on by them to the leading bodies of NATO." He emphasized that the Soviet Union does not view Norway, nor any other state in the world, as an enemy. During the visit, the members of the Soviet military delegation were constantly aware of the friendly attitude of the Norwegians. The peaceable character of their relations is most clearly noticeable in the region of the Soviet-Norwegian border, where soldiers from both sides organize sporting competitions, play soccer together, meet on holidays, and exchange delegations. P. Grachev emphasized that "on the whole we have encountered very good mutual understanding, and we can see the military leadership of Norway striving to meet us half way and resolve complex issues by means of talks."

During the conversations that were held, the issue of the grouping of Soviet forces on the Kola Peninsula was touched upon. Our delegation stated that over the last three years there have been major reductions made in the numbers of the forces and in their arms. Representatives of both sides have agreed that the grouping of forces on the Kola peninsula is defensive. P. Grachev noted the concern shown by the Norwegians as to how effective control is over Soviet nuclear weapons.

The USSR first deputy minister of defense noted that during his visit to Norway agreements have been reached on the continuation and deepening of Soviet-Norwegian contacts in the military sphere, the exchanging of delegations at various levels, and about providing each other with regular information concerning changes in circumstances in the border region of the USSR and Norway.

Group Continues Wallenberg Investigation

OW0111064891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1700 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The second meeting of the Soviet-Swedish working group investigating the fate of the Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg was held in Moscow yesterday (30th October).

The USSR KGB public relations centre has announced that during the exchange of opinions on the work carried out over the last two months KGB representatives gave the Swedish side copies of several documents unearthed during the ongoing search of KGB archives.

An RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] peoples' deputy, N. Arzhannikov, participated in the meeting in the capacity of an independent expert.

Raoul Wallenberg was arrested by the Soviet security services in Budapest in 1945, after which he was taken to the USSR. There is no further trace of him.

France Grants Fr1.6 Billion in Food Credit

LD0311053491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] France has granted our country credit worth 1.6 billion French francs for purchasing foodstuffs. An agreement to this effect has been signed in Paris by French Prime Minister Edith Cresson and Yuriy Chumakov, deputy USSR minister of foreign economic relations. The document provides, inter alia, for the delivery to the Soviet Union of 100,000 tonnes of beef, as well as powdered milk and baby foods. Most of the food will go to Moscow.

The Soviet side undertakes to pay off the credit with supplies of oil, gas, and petroleum products, partly over one year and partly over two, Chumakov told the TASS correspondent. According to Chumakov, this is the first in a series of similar agreements with Western countries.

From Paris, Chumakov goes to Brussels to initial an agreement between the USSR and European Community on granting our country food credit worth 500 million ECU's, European Currency Units.

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro Praises Soviet People at Havana Fair

LD0411101391 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Text] Havana November 4 TASS—Soviet people were and will be our friends. Although some of them want out we shall always be grateful to them for what they did for our country, Cuban leader Fidel Castro said at an opening ceremony of the ninth international fair in Havana on Sunday [3 November].

More than 700 firms from 24 countries are taking part in the Havana fair this year, with Spanish and Latin American companies enjoying more room than others.

Cuba is represented by 110 trading and health service enterprises.

Cuba is pinning special hopes on this fair, regarded as the main commercial event of the year. The stress is laid on creating conditions in order to get foreign partners interested in establishing mixed enterprises.

Addressing hundreds of foreign entrepreneurs who arrived to attend the fair, the Cuban leader noted that his country had "the most precious gold stock"—experience and wisdom accumulated while overcoming the economic blockade and difficulties that arose in the wake of the disintegration of the socialist camp.

Cuban Nuclear Power Experts To Train in USSR

LD0111110891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Cuban experts will get four months' work experience at Kola Atomic Power Station [AES]. Correspondent Yuriy Arkhipov for Radio Rossi's news service reports that Cuba is taking its first steps in the sphere of atomic power. Its only atomic power station, to go into service in two years, is called Juragua and is being built with the aid of Soviet experts to the design of Kola AES. Therefore, the Cuban authorities agreed to their experts getting experience in Polyarnyye Zori, where the station is located.

Reactor control engineers, operational engineers, chemical technologists, deputy heads of workshop, and shift leaders at the Cuban atomic power station will in the next four months be students getting work experience. Their training will be carried out under a special program. Cubans have already had work experience at Novovoronezhskaya AES, but that was mainly theory. At Kola AES they will get practical studies.

The Cubans are serious about their studies. Their country is paying quite a large sum of money for them. The sum agreed in the contract with Zagranenergo for the training at Kola AES is no less than $240,000. If you take into account that this is not the first or the last such visit you can imagine that Cuba is not ungenerous with funds for this purpose. Cuba thinks it will be paid back as they will just have to switch on the station and get electricity.

Supreme Soviet

Session Held on 1 Nov; Official Comments

LD0111195691

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 1230 GMT on 1 November carries a seven-minute report by parliamentary correspondent Olga Vasilenko on the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet session of 1 November.

The two chambers are working separately today. After returning the draft law on amnesty for servicemen refusing to do their military service to the Soviet of the Union, the Soviet of the Republics turned to internal matters but discussed these in a closed session, reminiscent of the old parliament and offering little to journalists, Vasilenko notes. She goes on to state that the "more democratic" Soviet of the Union has been dealing with organizational matters.

Next, Vasilenko interviews Yuriy Ivanovich Voronezhtsev, deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union, who affirms that the chamber continues to examine matters left over from the previous parliamentary session and documents such as the drafts submitted by Yeltsin on the abolition of the State Security Committee and the loan for 30 billion rubles. A commission is working on this. This, Voronezhtsev explains, is "because puzzlement, to say the least, was evoked among the deputies by the president's form of address to the Supreme Soviet. It seems our president has forgotten that the Supreme Soviet now possesses the functions of the congress and it was the congress which elected the president. One would, therefore, like to have, let's say, a more respectful attitude from the president toward the parliament of the country, now that it exists and has begun work."

Vasilenko says: "I very much hope all the same for mutual understanding between the supreme soviet and the president. Very much indeed."

Voronezhstev continues: "Naturally. We put the gaffe down to the fact that the president is so busy. He's gone ... already returned from abroad. That's very important work. But in the future I think we will work more closely together than at present."

Vasilenko next turns to the fact that in the commissions of the Soviet most of the deputies are from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, despite the right of deputies from the Ukraine, Moldova, Azerbaijan, and so on to be consulted. Voronezhstev acknowledges that this lack is felt and cites Article 3 from the statement read at the RSFSR congress and signed by the USSR president and the supreme leaders of the union republics, which says that "in the conditions of a transitional period a body should be created which would have legislative functions". When this has been signed by the republican leaders "it is strange that their signatures should prove so short-lived". He notes that the absent deputies have been asked to attend and talks to this end are continuing.

Voronezhtsev says he is convinced that in the long run deputies from these republics will attend as full participants. "It is clear to any unprejudiced person that the only legitimate, interrepublic, let's call it, body we have, is this Supreme Soviet. It may not be a very good one. It may not have been elected according to quite the right principles but it's the only one there is and while we sit here in the Kremlin there is a chance that the process, the objective process of the break-up of the Union will not turn into uncontrolled, uncivilized and horrendous collapse. For this reason, we are defending primarily not the interests of the governments of the republics, the sovereign states, but the interests of the peoples of those sovereign states. That is why we are here and why we are at work."

Military Amnesty Law Adopted

LD0211015991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1642 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Nov (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondents report from the Kremlin:

The Soviet of the Republics and the Soviet of the Union adopted a law "on an amnesty for servicemen who refuse to perform military service," which was introduced to the USSR Supreme Soviet by the country's president. This is the first legislative act approved by the Union parliament of the new convocation.

The morning sitting of the Soviet of the Republics was dedicated to the discussion of this draft law for the document had already "passed through" the Soviet of the Union. Yuriy Kalmykov, chairman of the commission for legislation of the Soviet of the Union, presented it and stressed that this document is a kind of reaction to nonregulation relations and other negative phenomena in the Army.

A debate got going around the paragraphs on who will monitor the execution of the law; in particular, this concerned the committee for the affairs of servicemen and members of their families set up under the USSR president. In the opinion of many of those who spoke, the bodies of the USSR procurator's office and the country's parliament should remain "the main figures" in this matter.

The law will be sent to the USSR president for signing.

IZVESTIYA Calls Supreme Soviet 'Uneven'

PM0111142191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Nov 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by parliamentary observer A. Stepovoy: "Parliament Shows Its Nature"]

[Text] The country's renovated and reformed Supreme Soviet seems to have taken its first step. It would seem that the present Union parliament should experience some inferiority complex: However that may be, three have renounced their full parental rights to the "child." They now view it from the side as it were, wondering how it will turn out.

And to judge by its first little steps, the new state organ may turn out to be a very "difficult adolescent." Without yet having found its feet in earnest (the chairmen of the chambers have only just been named and not all leaders of the permanent commissions have yet been appointed), the union parliament is already showing its nature. This applies to a greater degree to the lower chamber—the Soviet of the Union. In its still unstrengthened but quite resonant voice the Soviet of the Union has twice said "no" to the USSR president's proposals.

One of them concerned M. Gorbachev's appeal on the approval of the decision for the USSR State Bank to grant credit to the country's Ministry of Finances, the other concerned the examination of the draft law on the reorganization of the state security organs.

What did the chamber's new personnel dislike? Primarily the form of communication. In the appeal to parliament itself the deputies discerned disrespect for themselves in several areas. First, the USSR president's statement proposing that the Ministry of Finances be granted credit to the sum of 30 billion rubles [R] to finance urgent expenses says that "this question has been resolved positively." The parliamentarians were asked merely to approve the decision on the matter. And to facilitate the fulfillment of this task the document had appended to it the finished draft of... the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution. With an affirmative resolution, of course.

Second, the Union parliament was asked to approve the president's proposal "blind," without investigating the thrust of the matter. Where will this money go, to finance what programs? The questions remained unanswered.

Third, the deputies were perplexed as to why the president's document did not indicate the day it was signed? That gave grounds for supposing that the credit had already been issued and the union parliament, to which the Gosbank [State Bank] is directly subordinate, had been assigned the role of a figurehead.

That us why voices were heard calling for the president's decision to be suspended and even deemed illegal. In this connection there arose the question of the place and role of the USSR Gosbank. It was recognized that, removed from the influence of any political structures in our state, it has still not become free and independent. But that is a separate issue. Right now a reply to the president's appeal brooks no delay. Understandably, any negative reply may result in millions of people not being paid their wages, with all the ensuing social consequences, particularly unpredictable on the eve of the expected release of prices.

Here too the Soviet of the Union, leaving aside its vanity to some extent, demonstrated common sense. A commission has been created which has been instructed to study this problem in detail and to present its conclusion within a week. In addition the country's Gosbank has been given some freedom to act. Its chairman, V. Gerashchenko, was reminded that legislation allows the bank to take an independent decision on the question of credit. It is true that the deputies retain the right to assess such a decision.

The president's other appeal—to review the draft law on the reorganization of the state security services—was even unluckier. The deputies reckoned that the document's content does not accord with its title, since it in fact discusses the complete abolition of these organs. Here the members of the Soviet of the Union displayed great obstinacy, refusing even to include this question on the agenda together with a formula that was offensive to the president: "in connection with its unprepared nature."

The new Soviet of the Union has also, as official character references used to write, displayed its political skill. The members of this chamber honored Political Prisoner's Day, marked 30 October in the country, with a minute's silence. Alas, that cannot be said of the USSR Supreme Soviet as a whole. In the Soviet of Republics this date went unnoticed. What was this: simple forgetfulness or a demonstration of the totally apolitical nature of the Union parliament's upper chamber?

As we can see, so far the nature of the country's new Supreme Soviet is uneven.

Soviet of Union Meeting Begins on 4 Nov

LD0411090791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0840 GMT 4 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Nov (TASS)—Another meeting of the Soviet of the Union started in the Kremlin today. It started with discussion of electing chairmen for a number of commissions. As has been already reported, the Soviet of the Republics will be working in committees and commissions for a week. A plenary meeting of the chamber will take place on 12 November.

During the first 10 days of its activity, the USSR Supreme Soviet, with the new membership, has passed one law and resolved most of the organizational issues. Chairmen of the Soviet of the Republics and of the Soviet of the Union, as well as their deputies, have been elected, and committees and commissions have been formed.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Addresses State Council 4 Nov

LD0411151191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1310 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Speech by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev at opening of USSR State Council session in Moscow on 4 November—recorded]

[Text] I get the impression that we have somehow frivolously and without due responsibility disposed of the capital which we acquired after the coup and after the immense joint work that ensured the success of the congress and the adoption of decisions on the basis of the joint statement of the republics' leaders. Above all, when I speak about this capital, I mean that, at that time, hope emerged in people, and in all of us. All of us gained confidence that the situation could be managed, that it could be brought under control, that the country could be led more surely along the path of reform and could emerge from crisis more quickly.

Back then, we all felt particularly keenly and we all came to the realization that the disintegration of the state could not be allowed. We peered over the edge, as they say, and saw the whole abyss into which we could slide if this were to happen; second, a realization that a split in the democratic forces was impermissible, and that there should rather be a consolidation of everything; and third, a realization of the need to act jointly and to emerge together from the crisis.

I have to say frankly that the first weeks of harmonious work reinforced this confidence. People, the country, all in all, supported this approach and these feelings, and this was very important. But subsequently, after these first weeks the procrastination began once again. I believe the political games appeared again, the tug-of-war or the pulling-on-the-blanket. And this is evident on the main issues. I'm not even going to talk about the small things now. The birth of the Economic Treaty and its follow-up agreements is agonizingly painful. There is great difficulty in involving people in this joint work, which everyone acknowledges to be essential and which, most importantly, life itself dictates.

I have to say that the work on the draft Union treaty is going ahead with great difficulty. The treaty—as we have all agreed—is our common initiative, as it were, that this should be the first proposal and that it should be followed. I don't want to generalize and immediately equate and put on the same footing... And there are great differences in our positions. But nonetheless this phenomenon exists and it is holding up all the processes—holding up all the processes. I have to say that we are finding time for everything, for what is necessary, and without which there can be no further movement at all.

But in many cases this is actually being given only secondary attention. One way or the other that is the case. Meanwhile, to be frank, the country is suffocating because these most important questions have not been clarified. All this is very dangerous, and the State Council—that's you and me, comrades—bears responsibility for all this. Therefore, my first point is that we must restore the dynamism, the understanding, and responsibility which emerged after the coup and act on that basis, on those approaches, on that position, settling all the questions which face us. All hesitation must be overcome. Maybe you will even express your views as to why this is happening in our country. Why is it happening? That's the first thing.

Second, the central question of the present situation in the country is the program of measures to speed up the reforms which has been announced by the president of Russia. I hope that the State Council will support the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] leadership's initiative to speed up the reforms. I think that the country also expects to hear what the State Council's position is on this question, which is now one of the central questions.

I have already spoken in support of the general tendency of the measures proposed by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and today I reaffirm that. I know, too, that many of you have expressed your attitude in principle. But let me say frankly that I am seriously worried about the the clarity—or lack thereof—of a clear position, in that speech, in that program and package of reforms with regard to the Economic Community Treaty.

The values—above all, the need for the closest cooperation with the members of the economic community—I think this is a question of principle, since neither Russia itself nor, still less, the other republics can cope with the present dramatic situation by going it alone. They won't be able to avoid the catastrophic consequences by acting in isolation.

Boris Nikolayevich and I had a meeting, we had a frank conversation and exchange of views, and to my direct question I was given the firm answer, from him, that Russia will act within the framework of the economy treaty, and has no thought of any other approach. Moreover, it will play a constructive, initiating role in that interaction; but Russia is also counting on constructive work and a constructive contribution by all the republics.

That being so, tomorrow we can already... [changes thought] I think in the framework, we must organize the work of preparing the necessary documents. The more so since the Russians, I understand, have prepared a package of reforms and they can become the basis for joint coordinated work. And the main thing, comrades, is that we cannot now in this very complicated situation in which the country finds itself, panic on the political level, on the level of the State Council, the government and the leadership of the republics. We cannot allow the market to destroyed, the market to break down, barriers to be created and prices to be introduced without coordination, and so on.

In a word, I must say bluntly that withrawing into a shell will save no one. It's an illusion. So I think we must formulate our position here and determine what to do in specific terms in working together to accelerate reform. But one very serious trend which has emerged as a result of the announcement of the package of reforms is the unprecedented stir on the consumer market, which is truly chaotic. And this in our hard conditions. Evidently what we're faced with is yet another miscalculation.

The mistakes of 1990 were made again, they were made again at the beginning of 1991, too. Then, we, Boris Nikolayevich and I, announced ... we were told that it was just about to take place, therefore, we waited ... but we greet those who said this. I think comrades that what we are faced with is yet another miscalculation. You recall when assessments were given on behalf of the Ryzhkov government and then nothing was done for months on end. We destroyed the market. You recall at the end of last year we announced the drop ... the rise in prices and then, I won't give the reasons for that now, that occurred probably within two months at least, of that. After all, we ....that was said in January in the economic agreement, strictly speaking, but we did it in April.

Now, you understand, people have for themselves singled out of everything that was said, the fact that the liberalization of prices will take place any day now. And, generally speaking, after all, we cannot let prices go now without having decided the question of giving incentives to producers or having decided questions of, having taken decisions on demonopolization for our monopolist will use all of that up— without having taken measures now already to cut budget expenditure, without having giving incentives to entrepreneurs.

On the whole, society probably has not been informed that in our concrete situation we are not rejecting any form of regulating these prices, in any case, of those few products or goods which will be ... which may, so to speak, undermine that whole process and give rise to a negative reaction, which will not allow us together, having reached agreement with the people, to proceed along the path. This is what I was told yesterday when I inquired, and Gavriil Kharitonovich [Popov—mayor of Moscow] will confirm this, that within the previous 24 hours, 1,800 tons of bread had been sold in Moscow, is that not right? Yesterday, 2,500 tons were sold and the situation is not easing. So, I would... [changes thought] goods are being bought up.

Today I have this information from GUM [State Department Store] that goods are beginning to be held back in anticipation of higher prices. A fall in traders and produce has been noted at Moscow's markets—they too are waiting for price rises. In short, the situation is such that we could find ourselves facing a potential explosion. I think that instructions need to be given urgently as to what should be done immediately. Otherwise, there will be... At first, Gavriil Kharitonovich and I discussed on Saturday, or was it Friday, how to stop the run on the savings banks. It seems that we reached agreement on this and the Russian leadership expressed its view. I do not know to what extent this helped but, all the same, the run seems to have eased.

But as far as the stir on the market is concerned, this has already spread from Moscow, it has already reached other republics. This is causing concern to everyone and we need to deal with this, otherwise people will start storming the shops of cooperatives and entrepreneurs and then state power as well. First, we need to give explanations, without delay and, second, to define our steps precisely.

On the whole, to sum up my arguments regarding this central issue, namely Russia's program to speed up reform, I would like to say, on the basis of what has already been said, that what is needed now is the most intensive coordinated work by the republics. Moreover, this is needed tomorrow, without delay, in order to act together and to prevent the whole situation from being rendered unstable at present. And this is obvious. Such processes have begun.

Intensive work with Western partners is needed. I have to say that this is, all in all, a difficult task and I should inform you, on the basis of my recent meetings and talks in Madrid and Paris, that the main difficulty is that people are afraid of the disintegration of the Union. People are afraid of the disintegration of the Union.

The key issue of preserving the Union has been repeatedly pointed out. This has been underlined by our Western partners. They are trying to convince us and me of this and of a speedy conclusion of the Union treaty of sovereign states. They know that we are working on all this. They cannot comprehend what is going on with us. Have we have completely lost our heads? Every other day we hear in the Union statements which send shudders down the spine in the West. Visitors travel the world and present such a discordance of views on the situation and the prospects of the development of our state, of the Union that it all just simply bewilders them. I was mostly questioned on this for three days—two and a half days, I must say here.

There they understood long ago that while renewal and reform of the Union is a desirable thing, that it is in our interests and the West's interests, it must be preserved without fail as one of the fundamental bulwarks of the contemporary world, of strategic balance in the world.

What about us? Our people understand this. I have just received the results of an opinion poll carried out in the country between 11 and 21 October. Where was this poll conducted? In Alma-Ata, Kiev, Moscow, and Krasnoyarsk. Our people's attitude toward the Union is as follows: 78.2 percent favor the Union in Alma-Ata, 55 percent in Kiev, 72.6 percent in Moscow, and 67.9 percent in Krasnoyarsk. The poll was conducted by the center for operational research of the Institute of Sociology of the USSR Academy of Sciences. [following this

version of Gorbachev's address, the announcer adds: "In his address the USSR President also analyzed questions of international policy"]

Remarks on Western Aid

LD0411124591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1206 GMT 4 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Zheleznov, Ivan Ivanov, and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Nov (USSR)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev named the issue "of the current moment" as the main point at today's USSR State Council session which opened in the Kremlin. Giving an appraisal to this in his introductory speech, he stated that "we are in a very severe and critical situation".

The impression is being given, Gorbachev stated, "that we have irresponsibily managed the capital which we received after the putsch." At that time there was hope, he continued, that the situation could be taken under control, that we might go along the path of reforms and not permit the disintegration of the Union. "This did not occur, we glanced into the abyss," Gorbachev noted.

According to the USSR president, the Economic Community Treaty and the Union Treaty are "being born painfully" due to the difference in the republics' positions. Gorbachev supported the reform program put forward last week by Russian President Boris Yeltsin. Nevertheless, the speaker noted: An independent Russia and the other republics "will not be able to cope with this tragic situation." The disintegration of the market which exists must not be permitted and the creation of additional obstacles is impermissible, the head of the Soviet state said. Despite the fact that the freeing of prices is occurring on a daily basis, measures to stimulate labor, to protect the needy, among others, have not yet been adopted.

Gorbachev gave a high appraisal to the West's position which is directed toward rendering aid to the USSR during this difficult period. Touching on the Soviet Union's food supply problem, he stressed that if a system for its transportation and distribution is organized in the country in the near future, then "the food issue will be successfully resolved" during the next eight months.

Government Heads of Economic Community Meet

Ministries To Cease Legal Existence

LD0111144191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 1 Nov

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Zheleznov and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Nov (TASS)—Some 80 ministries and other Union administration bodies will cease their legal existence as of 15 November. This decision, made today at the meeting of the council of the heads of government of the member states of the economic community, is directly linked to the structure of the Interstate Economic Committee [IEC] which was proposed here today.

It is envisaged that only such spheres of joint management of the Economic Community, like the Foreign Ministry, the Internal Affairs Ministry, the railways, power—with atomic power being spun off into an independent industry—and also the administration of the customs houses will be left within the IEC's structure. For the transition period, that is to say, until the conclusion of all 19 agreements, provided for by the Economic Community Treaty, it has been recommended to preserve the joint bodies of management in industries, where a rapid transition from the all-Union to the republican level involves great risk. This applies to merchant marine, communications, and civil aviation affairs, and also the need for the Currency Committee, the Interstate Pension Reserve Fund, and the Agency for Standardization and Meteorology to function over this period. Many members of the council of the heads of government proposed to temporarily leave open "this bloc of joint interests" for the entire transition period. In particular, the need was expressed for the formation of common structures in space research, in the preservation of objects of value, and in meteorology.

Further on Proceedings

OW0111201091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1748 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The participants in the meeting at the level of government heads of the 12 sovereign (ex-Soviet) countries that closed in Moscow nominated Ivan Silayev as head of the Interstate Economic Committee (IEC) to be established. The position, at the proposal of Belorus' Premier Vyacheslav Kebich, will be called "chairman of IEC - prime-minister of the community." Confirmation hearings at the State Council are to take place on November 4.

The meeting passed a resolution, subject to confirmation by the State Council, that abolishes 36 Union ministries on November 15, 1991, and 37 other bodies, including the Military-Industrial Commission, the Council for Religious Matters, the National Attestation Commission, the Committee for Lenin Prizes, the Personal Pensions Committee, etc. The Union ministries had a combined staff of around 96,000.

It as recommended to keep the Defense, Energy, Interior, Railway, Nuclear Energy and Industry Ministries, the Customs Committee, the Aerospace Department, and the Foreign Ministry.

It as also recommended to maintain, for an indeterminate period of time, the Communications Ministry, the Foreign-Exchange Committee, the Agency for Standardization and Metrology, the Interstate Pension Fund. Another survivor is the State Committee for Material

Resources which allocates resources for, specifically, relief efforts after disasters, the spring sowing and for containing emergencies in the industry. If scrapped, a division of its assets is inevitable, of which 75 percent are on Russian territory.

The Civil Aviation and the Marine Ministries are to be abolished on January 1, 1992.

What is to be done with the USSR Gokhran (the body responsible for the storage of national gold reserves), that is to be given the axe on November 15, is not clear. 1/3 of its resources are kept in Moscow, says Mr. Rayevskiy, deputy finance minister, and the remaining 2/3, "elsewhere in Russia." According to him, all the republics can lay claim to the reserves as each contributed to the formation of the fund. This opinion was eagerly upheld was the republican representatives but was challenged by Oleg Lobov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, who said that during the last several months, none of the republics save Russia contributed to the gold stock. [sentence as received]

The issue was postponed till a November 9 conference at the level of heads of government of the sovereign republics that is to discuss the Soviet foreign debt-serwice.

The conferees approved of the Interstate Economic Committee's structure. Five or six of its departments and the food commission will perform the functions of an executive arm of the council of governmental heads of the sovereign states and of the conferences of ministers for individual economic sectors. Mr. Arkadiy Volskiy's proposal that the IEC should also be given broader, not purely executive, functions, but the motion was overruled. [sentence as received]

According to Silayev, the IEC staff must not be more than 1500. The IEC must start functioning even prior to the ratification of the Economic Community Treaty, following which its structure will be clarified once more.

Kebich Remarks on Functions

LD0111200191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Interview with V.F. Kebich, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Belarus Republic, by correspondent Golubev; in Moscow 1 November—live or recorded]

[Text] [Golubev] A session of the council of the heads of government of member states of the economic community took place in Moscow today. The status of the Interstate Economic Committee [IEC], which is to assume the role of a new Union government, was examined today. It is to work constantly, and primarily it is to occupy itself with operational matters connected with the formation of a single market for the community's member states.

What is to be the function of the council of heads of government?

[Kebich] First, it has the right to propose candidates for the post of chairman of the Interstate Economic Committee. Second, with a qualified majority, it has the right to remove that leader if, of course, he fails to carry out the will of the heads of government. Third, all major and fundamental issues to be resolved will have to be approved by this body; that is to say, by the council of heads of government. So, whatever the case, the council of heads of government will have the last word.

[Golubev] And in your republic, how was the statement about the reform of our [words indistinct] received?

[Kebich] Very badly. It was received very badly because, for all intents and purposes, both in the economic treaty and in the bilateral intergovernmental agreements we have signed, we said that any actions, particularly regarding price formation and other issues, must be taken as coordinated actions. On this occasion, the unexpected wish of one person shook all of us.

[Golubev] Nevertheless, the council of the heads of government of the community member states worked calmly and constructively.

Future of TASS Considered

LD0111205291 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Zheleznov and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—The Soviet national press and media outlets are not listed among the Soviet national ministries and other federal administration agencies to be abolished from November 15 in accordance with today's decision of the heads of government of the economic union's member-countries.

Asked if this means that the country will retain a single information centre, the role TASS new agency has been performing, deputy chairman of the Soviet Economic Management Committee Arkadiy Volskiy replied in the affirmative.

First of all, Volskiy said, structures are now being established within the future inter-state economic management committee which are vitally interested in a smoothly-functioning mechanism of gathering, processing and transmitting social, economic and commercial information.

Secondly, both the State Council and the president of the USSR are undoubtedly interested in a single and strong information centre, Volskiy said.

Council To Consider Fate of Foreign Ministry

OW0111172991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1537 GMT 1 Nov 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The future of the USSR Foreign Ministry will be decided at the meeting of the USSR State Council on Monday, November 4, a Russian Federation Foreign Ministry official told DP [Diplomatic Panorama]. He also expressed hope that the State Council would heed the opinion of the Russian Federation and of its president. Speaking at the 5th Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin said that the apparatus of the USSR Foreign Ministry must be cut down at least ten times and that its functions must be radically changed. The Soviet diplomat said that in the opinion of the Foreign Ministry and leaders of the Russian Federation, after reorganization the USSR Foreign Ministry should become a consultative and coordinating structure.

At all appearances, many republics share this opinion. On November 1, there was a conference of the republics' foreign ministers and their representatives. The USSR Foreign Ministry was represented by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko who is in charge of creating an executive secretariat which, by decision of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Republics, is to coordinate the republican foreign ministries' activity. The executive secretariat has not been set up yet and possibly will not be set up at all because the future of the council itself is highly questionable. At least its meeting, scheduled for November 5, has been cancelled.

Meanwhile, discontent over USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin's inactivity is growing in the Foreign Ministry, said a high-ranking Foreign Ministry official who, for clear reasons, preferred to remain unnamed. In an interview to DP he [expressed] surprise over the fact that Mr. Pankin was still in Madrid at a time when the future of the USSR Foreign Ministry was being decided in Moscow. Boris Pankin is expected to return to Moscow on November 3 on the eve of the State Council's meeting, and, in the opinion of the Soviet diplomat, will not be able to do anything. "The minister's inactivity will cost the ministry too dear," he said. "Boris Pankin is not the person who would be able to safeguard the interests of the Union ministry," he noted, thus giving to understand that his opinion was shared by other diplomats.

Pankin Remarks on Yeltsin Proposal

LD0111194491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 1 Nov 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Foreign Minister Pankin has already made quite a few various statements in Madrid, and not only on the Near East problem. Some of his pronouncements were directly connected with our domestic matters.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Probably, on the way to Madrid you learned about Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's report which mentions a 10-fold reduction of the Union Foreign Ministry. What do you think about this?

[Pankin] On the one hand, we have no differences here. Boris Nikolayevich said that the Foreign Ministry should be preserved and must become a kind of coordinating center which would coordinate all our republics' appearances in the international arena. As regards this 10-fold number, I perceive it rather as a metaphor, you know. When people have not seen each other for a long time, they say: I have not seen you for ages! Perhaps, this number is of a similar nature. But of course, serious changes are ahead. Big reductions will be carried out at the expense of intelligence personnel, and we have already almost agreed upon this with Primakov and Bakatin.

Restructuring and transfer of some diplomats into republic foreign ministries are to be done, since, frankly speaking, until recently, in some cases the foreign ministries of certain republics were more like large protocol departments dealing with visits, receptions, and so on. And it is only now that they are beginning to get down to business in a serious way. [end recording]

Internal Affairs Ministries on Reorganization

LD0211205591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Unidentified correspondent report; from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Excerpt] A meeting of leaders of republican Ministries of Internal Affairs [MVD] took place the other day. The meeting was devoted to the USSR MVD's transformation into a department giving help locally and coordinating law-enforcement actions. Here is what Viktor Barannikov, USSR minister of internal affairs, said:

[Begin Barannikov recording] Frankly speaking, it is beyond doubt that it is impossible to find a way out of the crisis situation on one's own, without focusing efforts on common problems and issues. For us, professionals, the complexity of a period of transition consists in the degree of correctness to which we will determine our position in what regards consolidating efforts in combating crime, forming new structures, and efficiently fighting back this ugly phenomenon. [end recording]

National conflicts, a rise in violent crime, and international links of organized crime demand not only concerted actions but also large financial investments, because it is impossible to fight with bare hands crime which has attained such a high level. At the same time, each republic has its own specific features which should be examined in detail and taken into account when a final decision on the existence of the MVD and cooperation between republican departments is made.

The issue of internal troops was among other serious issues demanding special attention. It is planned to subordinate a quarter of the country's internal troops to the State Council and the president. The remaining part

will be subordinated to republics. Maybe this way the acute problem will be solved. [passage omitted]

Trade Unions Question Yeltsin Economic Policy

LD0111222291 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—"The enactment of Boris Yeltsin's economic programme calls for preventive measures to ensure social protection of citizens," says a statement of Soviet industrial trade unions adopted on Friday [1 November].

"Our anxiety," the statement says, "is prompted by the fact that the Russian programme, intended to stabilize the economic situation in the Republic of Russia, is sure to touch on the interests of the entire country. Soaring prices have already reduced millions of our countrymen to existence below the poverty line, and further liberalization of prices will plunge the country into an abyss of poverty".

Industrial trade unions believe that it is necessary to work out an employment programme, speed up the approval in republics of minimum consumer budgets and lift restrictions on the growth of wages.

It is necessary to introduce in November a system ensuring the provision of food, consumer goods and medicines to individuals. Bread, milk, butter, sugar, serials and sugar should be rationed for all citizens of the country.

Confederation of Trade Unions Congress Opens

LD0211064291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0300 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] The first congress of the Confederation of Free Trade Unions [CFTU] opens in Moscow today. The CFTU must be organizationally and financially united so that it can be active, CFTU Chairman Aleksandr Alekseyev told a RIA correspondent. This is why the congress is being held. Alekseyev considers the main task of the independent unions to be the creation of strong structures which can pressure the authorities in the interests of the social protection of people. Another important task of the independent unions, according to Alekseyev, is to achieve the changing of the union law on trades unions which stipulates their registration. This makes the unions dependent on the state, he considers. The CFTU, which according to Alekseyev unites around 80,000 people, will not register on principle, and in accordance with the present law it will be considered an illegal organization as of 1 January 1992.

CPSU Financial Scandals May Affect Treaties

OW0111173891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1537 GMT 1 Nov 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The materials highlighting the former Communist Party's financial dealings with the Communist Parties of other countries may deal a serious blow on the USSR's foreign policy. The Soviet diplomatic quarters prefer not to comment on the recently published facts pointing to the Communist Party's financial support for the Communist Party of Portugal. However, unofficially, fears are expressed lest exposure may disawow the agreements which have been concluded with European states over the past few years by Mikhail Gorbachev as General Secretary of the Communist Party's Central Committee.

If the CPSU-gate produces more exposures, any international investigation started in this connection will inevitably lead to accusations against the USSR of violating the norms developed by the Europeans in Helsinki and Paris. All this may threaten the treaties on cooperation with France, Italy, Spain and some other European states. While these treaties were being drafted Moscow claimed it was guided by the principles of the general European process.

As the role of the Communist Party's last general secretary in the secret financing of the Communist Parties will be emerging into the limelight, the Western partners will have fewer doubts about who exactly in the former Soviet Union they should deal with.

Prosecutor General, Lawyers on Coup Case

LD0411083391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0510 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Text] Moscow, 4 Nov (TASS)—What will be the future of the leaders of the unsuccessful coup who have been arrested? Why have some high-ranking Soviet officials committed suicide? Who handed over a video cassette recording of the interrogation of the leaders of the State Committee of the State of Emergency to DER SPIEGEL magazine and for what purpose?

These questions were the subject of a meeting between Starkov, editor in chief of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, and Russian Prosecutor General Stepankov, and the lawyers of those who are under investigation in the case of the State Committee for the State of Emergency. In the opinion of the meeting participants, the putschists and the three party functionaries who committed suicide would most likely not have been able to face the disgrace and the prospects of the "transition" from high-ranking posts to the position of ordinary "convicts." Another version, however, was also put forward. They were probably ... programmed for self-destruction in the manner of engineered people called "zombies" to ensure that undesired facts were not made public. In any case, in

the opinion of the meeting participants, "a certain pressure had been brought to bear on them." Cited to confirm this was the opinion of Anatoliy Lukyanov who thinks that the interval of five hours between the search and the arrest was consciously effected in order to give him time to commit suicide. The suicide of Boris Pugo does, according to Stepankov's admission, stand out in this chain, since his death is "the result of a lack of professionalism" on the part of the Russian procuracy staff who came to arrest him.

Lively discussion developed around the leak of investigation materials and the handing over of a copy of the video recordings of the interrogations of the leaders of the State Committee for the State of Emergency to the magazine DER SPIEGEL. According to one version they could have been handed over to the German journalists for the purpose of discrediting the Russian procuracy. The lawyers of those arrested and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic prosecutor general adhere to this view.

The author of the second version is USSR People's Deputy Kalugin. He disclosed a state secret about the fact that for a long time DER SPIEGEL was used by the KGB for disinformation purposes. According to him, the purpose of handing over copies of the video recording to the magazine was to distract the attention of the investigation and the public from the true details and individual facts about what happened.

Evidently, we shall soon learn how things stood in actual fact because the investigation, according to a statement by the Russian procuracy head, is being conducted in a scrupulous manner, and some shifts have already taken shape. The future fate of the arrested August putsch leaders should be decided by the court at which each of the accused will bear responsibility for what he himself has done. But, it was the common opinion of those assembled at the television studio that the putschists should get their deserts "not for conviction, not for political opinions, and in no way for a system which was already thoroughly rotten through and through." They should only be answerable before the court in the event that there is evidence that in realizing their own beliefs they broke the law.

Documents Reveal Nuclear Waste Dumping

LD0311194191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Video report by correspondent V. Anuchin, including comments by USSR people's deputy A.A. Zolotkov—from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] These documents—or, to be more precise, the correspondence marked with the "top secret" seal—were given to us by the Murmansk Oblast KGB Directorate. They are dated 13 July 1990 and 8 February 1991 and were sent to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the country's president, and Kryuchkov, the former chairman of the USSR KGB. I will read several excerpts from this correspondence:

An intolerable situation has come about in organizing and carrying out the reloading of nuclear reactors, as well as in collecting and storing nuclear waste, in the Northern Fleet. Thousands of tons of such waste have piled up. Some of it was dumped in the Barents and Kara Seas in the Novaya Zemlya region. Affected by the sea environment, the sunken containers disintegrated, posing real danger to the fishing areas, sea creatures, navigation, and to the residents of the Kola Peninsula, of course, as well as to the residents of Arkhangelsk Oblast. The sinking of the containers was carried out in shallow seas. In some instances, when they failed to sink, they were shot at. Sometimes these containers were washed up on the coast where they were smashed against the rocks by sea waves.

The country's president instructed the former Council of Ministers and the Ministry of Defense to take urgent measures. But there was no reaction to this. There was no reply to the second letter, which was addressed to the former chairman of the USSR KGB.

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has announced a moratorium on nuclear tests in the Novaya Zemlya region. But the problems are still here.

[Zolotkov] We must treat this problem seriously and start to set up a single site where the waste from both the Navy and the merchant fleet is to be dumped. Moreover, this site should belong to no particular department, because all these places [points to areas on a map] result from the activities of a certain department. The site should be open for inspection by both international experts and the public.

Poll on Autonomous Republics in RSFSR Taken

OW0211091091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1704 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A poll taken by the National Public Opinion Studies Center in October shows that the majority of the population of the country is not against allowing autonomous republics to withdraw from the Russian Federation. 50% of those questioned replied that they supported the autonomous regions' attempts to become independent states.

24% spoke out against granting the regions independence, and said that all attempts to free such regions should be repelled.

26% did not give a specific answer.

It is worth noting that in Russia itself the lowest percentage of the population supported autonomous regions' withdrawal from the republic autonomous

republics found the largest percent of support in the Ukraine where 52% were in favor of independence for the autonomous regions. This poll was taken among 2053 people throughout the entire union in a representative selection, the "Data" agency reports.

Margin of error is 3%.

TASS Carries Press Reviews

1 Nov

LD0111081691 Moscow TASS in English 0756 GMT 1 Nov 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—All newspapers feature reports about the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. PRAVDA concentrates on Russian President Boris Yeltsin's speech and his request to grant him extra powers.

"The president asks powers that actually mean the abolition of legislative authority," People's Deputy V. Isayev told PRAVDA. "He proposes that he be extended the right to adopt all legislative acts himself and the right of veto within the seven-day term be reserved for the Supreme Soviet. The possibility of control on the part of supreme bodies of state power over the president's actions is significantly reduced."

In this regard, the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper emphasises: "It is clear even to the one who has no experience in politics and law that at point is the concentration in the hands of one person of the possible maximum of both executive and legislative power."

The KOMSOMOLSKAYA GAZETA newspaper expresses apprehension that resolutions proposed by Yeltsin can be scuttled in the sea of amendments. The TRUD newspaper points to the confusion that reigns at the congress.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments on the Russian president's decree on the legal support for the trade unions' activity. "The Russian president's decree elevates the trade unions' prestige to the universally-recognised standards of international law and makes it incumbent upon all, from the Council of Ministers to the most zealous businessman, to honour scrupulously the trade unions' rights," the newspaper stresses.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA draws attention to the ambiguous position of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the session of which is currently held in the Kremlin. It quotes Council of the Union Chairman Konstantin Lubenchenko as saying that "generally speaking, the chamber does not have a logical right to existence. Republics and they alone today define the possibility of forming union bodies and bringing stability to the country." In view of this, the newspaper points out "it is hardly possible to elaborate an effective programme of work without a clear strategic goal. Therefore, debates in parliament concentrate on the essence of its tasks."

In a signed dispatch, PRAVDA describes former Union republics' policy in the field of transport. The newspaper criticizes sovereign republics' authorities which are bent on dividing the USSR's transport network. Transport is cosmopolitan, it speaks as it were one language and its forced division into components threatens to cause huge losses, PRAVDA writes.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA comments on the problem of the stay of Soviet Armed Forces in the Baltic states. Publicist Vladimir Urban asks if Soviet troops will be withdrawn from the Baltics soon? Pointing out the legal nature of the demands for the earliest possible movement of Soviet troops out of these states, he underlines the "toughness" of their stance.

"Our possible accelerated withdrawal from the Baltics would influence not only the alignment of forces in the European security system but would also become the source of a new social explosion in the Army. It is exactly now that the CSCE participating states should adopt a declaration on the legal and social protection of persons who ensure global security," he writes.

PRAVDA reports that a law on the pay for land is adopted in Russia. Emphasising the social and political importance of this legal act, the newspaper writes that the new law presupposes the availability of a land market. Without this, the law will not work. PRAVDA believes the ten-year moratorium on land purchase and sale should be lifted.

Independent NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA paper editor Vitaliy Tretyakov expresses alarm over the future freedom of the press in the country. In a PRAVDA interview, he says the conflict between his newspaper and the Russian Ministry of Mass Media erupted over the publication in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA of an interview with First Deputy Prime Minister of the Ukraine Konstantin Masik. The Russian Ministry said this material contained the propaganda of war and inter-ethnic strife and issued an official warning to the newspaper.

USSR People's Deputy V. Samarin describes the current situation in the country as "dizzy without success". In an article under this title published in PRAVDA today he analyses the situation that has formed in the country after the August putsch. He writes that jubilation over the defeat of the putschists has inconspicuously grown into a frenzy of political ambitions. "Even republican leaders, who issued the joint statement at the fifth extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, have forgotten about the responsibility they voluntarily assumed—to prevent an uncontrollable disintegration of the Union state. The proclamation of the declaration of human rights and freedoms remained an empty sound for some republican governments."

In their sections dealing with international events newspapers report about the opening of the Madrid peace conference on the Middle East, the meeting between the Soviet and French presidents in Latche, civil internecine war in Yugoslavia and other events.

2 Nov

LD0211082891 Moscow TASS in English 0709 GMT 2 Nov 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—The key topic of publications in today's national newspapers is the programme of economic reforms unveiled by Russian President Boris Yeltsin at the Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper prints an interview with Boris Bolotin, a leading scholar at the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations. He said "market incentives cannot be used with the help of free prices in an absolutely non-market medium." Bolotin emphasised "ways for the transition to a market should be sought relying on old mechanisms."

"The Belorussian authorities are worried over Boris Yeltsin's economic initiatives," the independent NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA paper writes. Yeltsin's policy speech at the Congress of Russian People's Deputies forced Belorussian parliamentarians to delay the consideration of issues on their agenda and discuss the economic situation in the republic in connection with the Russian leader's statement on the possible introduction of free prices. The Belorussian parliament disapproved this step.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA features notes about the Russian president's meeting with the industrial union group of deputies, comprising heads of major Union enterprises, including those in the military- industrial sector. The "generals of production" voiced readiness to "welcome the strengthening of executive power" in Russia and the course of radicalising the economy pursued by Yeltsin on condition that the Russian president gives definite guarantees.

TRUD publishes a statement by the leaders of the country's sectoral trade unions, expressing concern that the proposed measures "are not of a comprehensive nature and are not shored up with the necessary social protection of the population." "Free prices do not automatically create a market. To begin with them, without having the entire range of market mechanisms, means to steer matters towards a social explosion," the statement says.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, referring to the computer forecast of the possible consequences of the implementation of Yeltsin's programme, unveiled at the congress, writes that "prices of manufactured goods will surge 25-fold by the end of 1992," the price of food will be 15 times higher and production will plunge below the necessary consumption level in 1992. The newspaper draws the conclusion that the population will not withstand this situation for more than three to four months and "the time to make new decisions and a new policy speech" will come in spring.

The disintegration of the state called the USSR and Russia's future are the topic of an article by Igor Shafarevich, a renowned scientist, publicist and one-time dissident, in PRAVDA. He writes "a narrow and closed circle of people, which is more anonymous today than previously, governs our country today just like 20, 50 or 70 years ago," although it consists of the self-same top party functionaries who a month, three months or a year ago stated about their withdrawal from the Soviet Communist Party.

Shafarevich emphasises that the only way to salvation is for Russia "to elaborate and pursue a consistent national policy." He believes ridding the country of the power of party functionaries should be the first necessary step.

"Business rather than revolution will save the country," believes Anzor Kikilashvili, president of the "21st century" association. In an interview with the same newspaper, he expresses the view that "the rebirth of the Union should occur on fundamentally new foundations, the so-called piles. In the old union, everything existed for the sake of the centre. Today, the centre will exist for the sake of independent, free states." Kikilashvili presumes that some East European countries will possibly wish to join a new economic space alongside the former Union republics.

"Kazakhstan had stood and continues to stand for the single armed forces," Sagadat Nurmagambetov, chairman of the republican state defence committee, said in an interview with the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper.

Asked, in the same newspaper, if Russia needs a nuclear test range, a Russian parliamentarian gives a positive answer, emphasising that nuclear tests are conducted not only to test weapons. They enable the country to develop the power engineering of the 21st century. All will encounter the shortage of energy in the short term, he contends.

TRUD published an excerpt from Mikhail Gorbachev's book "The August Putsch. Causes and Consequences", which will be brought out by the Nonosti publishers. The Soviet president believes the "plotters were doomed".

An article in the NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA paper titled "The USSR's Nuclear Might: On Land, at Sea and in the Air" tells in detail about the deployment of strategic offensive armaments on the country's territory. The authors of the article, staffers at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, compiled a pamphlet on this subject, which is being prepared for publication.

The same newspaper features an interview with Akhsarbek Galazov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the North Ossetian SSR, who said: "Mankind will have to solve the problem of the two Ossetias," folowing the example of Germany or Korea and mindful of the genocide unleashed by Georgia against the citizens of South Ossetia.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN reprinted from the new literary and historical magazine RUS, which appears in Rostov Veliky, fragments of the family correspondence of Russia's last Tsar Nikolay the second and Tsarina Aleksandra Fyodorovna.

Military

Radiation Accident at Submarine Facility

OW0111202591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1748 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO; "Emergency at a Military Submarine Facility in Severodvinsk"—INTERFAX headline]

[Text] On the night of November 1 there was an accident at a facility in the town of Severodvinsk, one of the world's biggest makers of nuclear submarines. According to the Arkhangelsk-based newspaper PRAVDA SEVERA, there was an accident when handling radioactive material in which efforts to return the material to a protective container failed.

It took nearly eight hours to cope with the accident, and radiation levels returned to normal. A staffer who handled the radioactive material was hospitalized. A special commission is investigating the accident.

Military Units To Remain in Baltic Territory

LD0211023991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0035 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Biryukov]

[Text] Baltiysk (Kaliningrad Oblast), 2 Nov (TASS)—USSR Armed Forces subunits will not leave Baltic territory until normal sociodomestic conditions are created for them at the new places where they are stationed. Representatives of officers' assemblies of military units and of workers collectives of Defense Ministry enterprises situated in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia stated this at a meeting with USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputies.

The appeal to the presidents of the country and of the RSFSR and to political leaders of the Baltic states says that the planned withdrawal of units of the Baltic Fleet, of land and border troops, and of antimissile defense subunits should be carried out only after these problems have been resolved and after a law on the status of the Russian-speaking population living in the Baltic republics has been adopted. The participants in the assembly elected a coordination council [koordinatsionyy sovet] which intends to represent the interests of servicemen at the forthcoming talks on this question.

Shaposhnikov on Ukraine Nuclear, Army Issues

LD0311182791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] The law says that all organizations engaged in defending the state are headed by the country's president and State Council, USSR Defense Minister Shaposhnikov said in an interview with the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, commenting on the decision of the Ukrainian parliament to place under its own jurisdiction the armed forces on Ukrainian soil. Ukraine does not claim possession of the nuclear button. The republic has the right to know where the weapons are located, but the center—the unified command—must control them, said Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov. The army should not be pulled out of the Ukraine, and a concept of collective defense should be worked out immediately, the marshal considers.

Air Defense Head on Professional Armed Forces

PM0111162991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2100 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Report by V. Lenskiy and Yu. Ruchkin from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Lenskiy] Army reform has been under discussion for five years, but until August 1991 perestroyka among the troops was confined merely to the political organs directorate and the discharge into the reserve of officers whom the supreme command thought undesirable. Vladimir Andreyev, deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces, was among them. Last year Marshal Yazov dismissed his superior, Army General Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces, but the generals involved in the coup resigned by themselves. Colonel General Prudnikov took Tretyak's place, and Vladimir Andreyev returned.

[V. Andreyev, deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces] First, people really do have to serve. Professionalism must be encouraged. People must be committed to military service so they feel they are serving the people.

[Lenskiy] General Andreyev believes that the Army must definitely be a professional army. The Air Force boss considers the Armed Forces being set up by the republics to be a reality today. In his view a united army is essential, and command of its strategic arms must be lodged with a single center.

Navy Command To Improve Working Conditions

PM0411125391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Report from TASS, RIA, and correspondents' round-up: "Naval Command Promises to Improve Situation of Navy Workers and Servicemen"]

[Text] The Navy Command will do everything possible on the basis of existing laws and partnership relations with trade unions to procure reserves to improve navy workers' labor and living conditions in market conditions. This was announced by Navy Commander in Chief Fleet Admiral Vladimir Chernavin, who met with members of the Navy Trade Union Central Committee and Fleet Trade Union Committee leaders. Problems to do with the social situation of fleet workers and servicemen—which Navy Trade Union Central Committee Chairman Viktor Trofimov described as difficult—were the focus of attention for the interlocutors.

Military Movement Requests Army Reform

OW0211032391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Coordinating Council of the movement "The Military for Democracy" has demanded today, Friday, that USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev who is also commander in chief of the Armed Forces should urgently discuss in the State Council the situation in the Army and measures to speed up a reform in that field.

The appeal points out "an extremely dangerous situation" in the Armed Forces. The republics set to secede from the Soviet Union "are grabbing power in the defence sphere", setting up autonomous and isolated national sovereign forces.

Decisions to that effect have been taken by Belarus [Belorussia], Azerbaijan, and Moldova. The Central Asian republics are creating defence departments and national guards. In the political struggle for presidencies and parliamentary seats they are playing the "military card".

Particular concern is expressed over processes in the Ukraine which has resolved to set up three branches of armed forces up to half a million men.

The Coordinating Council of the movement warns of jeopardy to the system of international treaties on disarmament and nuclear arms controls. The situation is explosive and "allows for no delays"—urges the appeal.

Defense Ministry To Reform Call-Up System

LD0211211891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1502 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Defense tabled its proposals on reforming the system of call-up and manning the USSR Armed Forces for consideration by the country's legislative bodies. Some of them will be implemented during the autumn call-up campaign, Major General Gennadiy Bochayev, head of the main organizational and mobilization directorate of the USSR Defense Ministry, told a TASS correspondent. In his words, this autumn's call-up of young people to the military service is continuing in accordance with the acting union legislation. At the same time, the proposals and demands of the sovereign republics concerning the young men's service in their own territory, as well as outside, are being considered, which, in the general's words, created quite a few problems.

Thus, he said, the leaders of Georgia and Moldova are against the call-up to the USSR Armed Forces. Armenia and Azerbaijan are in favor of the conscripts' service in their territory only. The republics of Central Asia agreed to send some of the young conscripts outside the republics' territory but not to the "hot spots." The positions of Belorussia and the Ukraine have not been clarified yet. It can be expected that with the situation developing in this way, the main brunt of manning the Armed Forces will again be borne by the conscripts from Russia.

Bochayev stressed that implementing the military reform depends on signing the Union treaty, which will determine the future of the country as well as the character of its Armed Forces. The USSR Defense Ministry intends to start the reform of the call-up system next year.

Among the reforms that have been proposed are the transfer of personnel to an 18 months' service and voluntary active military service by soldiers and navy men, sergeants, and petty officers on a contractual basis, the general said. In his words, the contract will be for 2.5 to 3 years. Later it may be extended. Service on a contractual basis is envisaged for women as well.

Bochayev did not rule out the possibility of difficulties in implementing the reforms. Thus, for example, the reduction of the term of active military service threatens a permanent shortage of a call-up contingent. While the introduction of a contractual system would lead to a considerable reduction in the numbers of trained military reserves, 15,000 to 20,000 million rubles will be required annually to pay the volunteers and build additional accommodations.

Baltic Affairs

Conditions for Soviet Troop Withdrawal Cited

LD0311112691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Russian 1300 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] Baltiysk, Kaliningrad Oblast—Until normal social and living conditions in the new areas of deployment are created, the units of the Soviet Armed Forces will not leave the Baltic territory. This has been stated at a meeting with the deputies of the USSR and the Russian Federation by representatives of the officers' meetings, military units, and the workers' collectives of the enterprises under the Ministry of Defense situated on the territories of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In additin, an appeal to the presidents of the country and of Russia, and to political leaders in the Baltic countries states that the intended withdrawal of the Baltic Fleet units, land, and border troops, and the anti-aircraft defense units must take place only after resolving these problems and after the adoption of a law on the status of the Russian-speaking population residing in the Baltic Republics.

The participants in the meeting elected a coordinating council which intends to represent the interests of the military at the coming negotiations on this issue.

We wish to recall here that similar statements have been adopted by the officers of the Vilnius and Kaunas garrisons. At the same time Marshal Shaposhnikov, USSR defense minister, has categorically stated that the forces would be withdrawn and, according to an agreement, as we have already reported, the withdrawal of airborne troops from Estonia will start on 3 November.

Estonia

Withdrawal of Soviet Troops To Begin 3 Nov

LD0211071991 Moscow TASS in English 0807 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Estonia begins on November 3. Paratroop units will leave the cities of Vyru and Viljandi, the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper reports today.

Lieutenant-General Bobryshev, chief of staff of the Baltic Military District, visited Vyru to sort out the dissolution and withdrawal of the batallion stationed there. "All work goes according to schedule," he told the newspaper's correspondent.

The Estonian Government, as is seen from the statement by its press secretary Chernov, insists that most Soviet troops will be home by the end of 1992.

Minister on Decline in USSR, Russian Imports

LD0211195291 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1500 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Recent news received from Latvia and Lithuania indicates a considerable decline in supplies from Russia and the USSR. Both Latvian and Lithuanian top civil servants have in quite a number of statements expressed the opinion that this amounts to a planned economic blockade against the three independent Baltic states.

Aleksander Sikkal, Estonian minister of material resources, acknowledged in an interview given to the Baltic News Service that recently supplies from Russia to Estonia have indeed declined. The gasoline shortage also demonstrates this. At the same time, in the opinion of Aleksander Sikkal, one cannot claim that this is the case of a planned economic blockade. In his opinion the cause is a general decline in the economic situation both in Russia and in the USSR as a whole.

Dwelling on the economic talks with Russia so as to conclude a 1992 trade agreement, Aleksander Sikkal noted that the conception of the talks keeps changing. If at first there was talk of about 250 articles of goods being supplied by the state then now it is 20 or 30 goods items of strategic importance, and accounting would be based at the level of world prices. The latest information received from Russia speaks of the possibility that it may altogether establish high export taxes instead of export quotas and licenses, and that exports would be regulated by economic methods instead of administrative ones.

Communist Leader Says Party Not To Disband

LD0211000491 Tallinn Estonian Radio in English 2130 GMT 28 Oct 91

[Text] The first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia, Enn-Arno Sillari, has announced that the party will not disband. According to the results of a recent poll, only 14 percent of party members favored its disbanding. Changes in the Communist Party program and its platform for the forthcoming elections to Estonia's new parliament will be discussed at a conference in December. Membership of the pro-independence Estonian Communist Party is estimated at 500.

Official Views Relay of Central Television

LD0311105891 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1500 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Mart Siimann, director general of Estonian Television, has said to the Baltic News Service agency that the issue of relaying Central Television programs on Estonian territory next year is still open. According to Siimann, the issue is due to be resolved within two weeks. He added that until recently there was no certainty that Central Television would continue to exist. Now, however, the USSR State Council is said to have allocated means to the Central Television for next year. According to Siimann, the relay will largely depend on

what Central Television will be like. If it becomes the television of the republics which have signed an economic agreement with each republic being given equal air time, then we will have no interest in relaying it. A provisional agreement with Russian Television has been reached to the effect that Estonia will not have to pay anything for relaying Russian television programs. Furthermore, Russian Television will pay for relaying the programs—along radio relay lines—up to the Estonian border. Estonia must spend means only on the exploitation of a television transmitter.

Latvia

U.S. To Provide Grain in 'Near Future'

LD0311131591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] Latvia's Council of Ministers Chairman Ivars Godmanis has returned to Riga from a trip to Germany and the United States. At the Latvian capital's airport, Godmanis told journalists that, in the near future, Latvia would be able to receive credits from private organizations and not from Western governments. He stressed that during his U.S. trip an agreement was reached on giving 100,000 tons of fodder grain each to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in the near future. According to the Latvian premier, this aid is free and is not part of the existing aid program.

Official Denies Reports of Trade War With RSFSR

LD0311132291 Riga Radio Riga International in English 0700 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] The head of the Latvian Economics Commission has denied allegations that a trade war is under way between Latvia and Russia. Mr. Ojars Kehris has been commenting on press reports that Russia is due to charge Latvia in hard currency for both raw materials and energy resources. There is no reason for us to expect Russia would be charging us less than other countries, he said. At the same time, nobody is free to dictate to Latvia what goods and services it should be selling for rubles. There are 27 enterprises in Latvia having absolute monopoly in the former Soviet Union. Hard currency payments could also be charged by Latvia for Russian goods and raw materials transported via Latvia's ports, a senior official of the Ministry of Economics said in a television interview last weekend. Deputy Minister of Economics Andrejs (?Godmanis) said the balance of mutual hard currency payments between Latvia and Russia was still to be resolved in talks between Latvian and Russian officials.

Registration of Most Immigrants Suspended 29 Oct

PM0311190791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "Registration of Immigrants Temporarily Ended"]

[Text] Riga, 29 Oct—In connection with the announcement of state independence a new government resolution regulating the influx of population into the republic has come into force in Latvia. Its essence is that the registration in the republic of "any persons who have come from the territory of other states" is ceasing until an immigration law is adopted.

True, the resolution also contains a number of provisos. The resolution does not extend, for example, to permanent residents of the Latvian Republic (who were this as of 16 June 1940) and their descendants who have returned to take up permanent residence in Latvia. With the permission of the department for migration affairs persons who have been on active military service in the USSR's military formations, who were discharged from service before 31 December 1991 inclusive, and who have returned to take up permanent residence in the Latvian Republic within six months of their discharge from service are registered if they had been permanently registered and lived in Latvia prior to service.

This same resolution ends exchanges of housing outside the republic, apart from cases where persons who fall within the status of "permanent residents and their descendants" move to Latvia as the result of an exchange. Every instance of an exchange of housing outside the republic is examined by the department for migration affairs.

Immigration Draft Bill Approved 2 Nov

OW0211192091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1712 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's Government approved a draft bill on the procedure of immigration.

Under the bill the number of those who come to live in Latvia will be limited by immigration quotas fixed each year by the citizenship and migration department.

Foreigners will be allowed to enter Latvia only through check points where the customs, border protection and internal affairs services will have their posts.

Upon their arrival foreigners will be granted permits for permanent or temporary residence. Those who come to Latvia for a period of time not exceeding one month will be able to enjoy the status of guests. If their entry is connected with work in Latvia, they'll have to present work permits.

The draft bill will be submitted to Latvia's parliament.

Organization Protests Decree on Citizenship

OW0211184591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1712 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Congress of Latvian Citizens involving people who lived in Latvia before 1940 and their offspring convened for a session in Riga today. It is planning to challenge the decree on citizenship adopted by Latvia's parliament.

A. Brentse, secretary of the congress, has told the newspaper "Diena" that its draft resolution provides for cancelling the parliamentary decree as "invalid and entailing no juridical consequences".

Radical-minded members of the congress resent the fact that when adopting the decree on the rules for naturalization, Latvia's parliament is willing to grant Latvian citizenship to people from other countries before elections to the Sejm (ne parliament) are held. According to them, this conflicts with Latvia's 1922 constitution and with norms of international law.

The leading body of the National Independence Movement of Latvia (NIML) sent a letter to the chairman of Latvia's parliament Anatolijs Gorbunovs, urging him to protect the interests of the Latvian nation.

The movement's deputy chairman M. Vitola told the nespaper "Diena" that the NIML opposes the adoption of legislation on citizenship by Latvia's parliament. The movement will seek to enable citizens of Latvia to receive Latvian passports which will designate the circle of the republic's citizens.

If the government decides to hinder this process, M. Vitola said, "we'll find another method of gaining our goal".

'Informers' Recruited in Possible 'Witchhunt'

OW0211192191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1712 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO; "Is Witch Hunt Beginning in Latvia?"—BALTFAX headline]

[Text] The newspaper "PILSONIS" (CITIZEN) reports that the coordinating center for decolonizing Latvia formed in the framework of the Congress of Latvian Citizens is engaged in vigorous endeavors to reveal people who committed or continue to commit crimes or other offences against Latvian citizens and their property. This relates primarily to those who actively worked in the Soviet period.

To reveal such people the center began to recruit informers who may remain anonymous.

The Congress of Latvian Citizens involves those who lived in Latvia before 1940 and their offspring.

Bartering for Gasoline Supplies Noted

PM0411124591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[Irina Litvinova report: "Even Police Cars' Gas Tanks Are Empty"]

[Text] Riga—The Latvian Government has announced emergency measures to supply the national economy and the population with fuel and petroleum products.

The situation is Riga is being described as critical. There is no fuel for the motor transport used to ship foodstuffs, and both police cars and the city's other services are "running on empty." There have been reports that two trains from Ufa were "lost" en route for Latvia for unknown reasons.

The leaders of the services responsible for gasoline supplies believe that the crisis is linked to Russia's demand to continue buying its oil either for convertible currency or at world prices. Specialists believe that the price of a liter of gasoline under these circumstances could hit 10-15 rubles [R].

Finnish firms have offered their services—gasoline for one and a half markkas a liter. At the commercial exchange rate that amounts to around R15. However, Latvians are hoping that it will prove possible to reach agreement with Russia on a more acceptable ruble clearing rate for mutual settlements.

In order to supply the republic with petroleum products the Cabinet of Ministers has allocated the "Latviyas nafta" [as transliterated] department the republic's "gold reserve"—10 microbuses for bartering. Next year another 50 Riga Automobile Plant buses will be allocated for these purposes.

Lithuania

Immediate Withdrawal of Soviet Forces Demanded

LD0311152391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1422 GMT 3 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius, 3 Nov (TASS)—It has been announced by Lithuanian Radio today that the Republic of Lithuania's Foreign Ministry has sent a note to the USSR Foreign Ministry. It states in particular that the process of regulating relations between the Lithunian Republic and the USSR is an extremely important task, and that the key question here is the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Lithuania.

The document also underlines that the inhabitants of Lithuania have repeatedly demanded an end to the occupation of the Baltic countries and the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the territory of the republic, as their deployment there has absolutely no legal basis. "The government of the Republic of Lithuania, in expressing

the will of its citizens, demands the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces, and hopes that this will help to create good-neighborly relations," the note points out.

Landsbergis on Date for Talks With USSR

LD0211071691 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius November 1 TASS—"It is impossible to give even a tentative date for the beginning of talks between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union yet," said Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis.

In a TASS interview, Landsbergis said an official letter about the appointment of a USSR delegation to conduct talks with the Lithuanian Republic and its leader had not yet been received. This information was monitored only on TASS channels but this source cannot be regarded as trustworthy, Landsbergis believes.

He thinks delaying talks benefits "those who have not yet prepared for them," that is the Soviet side.

Lansbergis said the two sides already had contacts, as a result of which they "agreed upon a forthcoming meeting between deputy head of the Lithuanian delegation Ceslovas Stankevicius and Eduard Shevardnadze." Shevardnadze was reported to have been appointed head of the Soviet delegation.

Landsbergis said he "wanted to see more signs of good will from the Soviet Union, for instance on such issues as troop withdrawal and the return of the buildings of the Lithuanian Embassies in Paris and Rome."

Republic Oil, Gas Reportedly in Short Supply

LD0211211291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0200 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The lines at gas stations should disappear at the end of this week in Lithuania, Radio Vilnius was told by officials at the Mazeikiai oil refinery. But it is obvious that the so called oil problem, and to the drivers the gas problem, will not disappear, and will be even more painful next year.

In nine months of this year the Mazeikiai oil refinery received and processed 9,309,000 tonnes of raw material. From this quantity 1,578,000 tonnes of gasoline were produced.

Radio Vilnius was told by the head of the enterprise's production section, Sigitas Butkus, 70,000 tonnes of gasoline above the plan promised at the beginning of the year to supply the enterprise with 2.6 million tonnes of oil in the last three months of the year. But at present this quantity has been reduced by 300,000 tonnes, and it could be reduced even more. The supply for November has been reduced by almost one-third. It has been promised to supply the enterprise with 628,000 tonnes. According to Sigitas Butkus, such a quantity of oil is not sufficient for the enterprise's normal work, but it is too large for one technological installation of the Mazeikiai refinery.

The enterprise can process 45,000 tones of oil per day. Of the processed oil, 50 percent is fuel oil,which is mostly used by thermal power stations, and less than 15 percent is gasoline. In order that technological lines do not break down, the enterprise must be supplied at least with 24,000 tonnes of raw material per day for both lines.

So far plans are ahead to obtain a large quantity of oil and process it in December, but there is no guarantee that the December supply plan will not be reduced. The shortage of gasoline in October is explained by the enterprise's officials by the fact that one technological line producing gasoline was stopped for overhaul. This overhaul lasted fom 1 October until 25 October. Last Tuesday the enterprise processed 29,000 tonnes of oil. It could have produced more gasoline, but it was short of raw material. By 27 October the enterprise exceeded the monthly plan for production of one kind of gasoline. The production of another kind of gasoline, the enterprise's workeres have assured, will be also above plan by the end of the month.

The enterprise's supply director, (Zigmantas Peckus), assured Radio Vilnius that by the end of this week there will be no lines at gasoline stations because they will be supplied with gasoline produced by the overhauled technological line.

As is known, oil is supplied to Mazeikiai by the Siberian oilfields. So far the enterprise has received the quantity of Lithuanian oil sufficient for a little more than one normal working day. During last year's blockade,the enterprise was applying efforts to arrange technical equipment to obtain the supply of oil not only by pipeline, by also by rail. The enterprise already has equipment to receive oil from railway cisterns, but the oil export and import enterprise at the Klaipeda port can unload from the tankers only 10,000 tonnes per day. Therefore Mazeikiai badly needs a new oil terminal on the coast. As is known, the government has started preparing for such construction already a long time ago in Karkle, Melnrage or somewhere else. But this is opposed by the greens and the residents in those localities.

At present Russia and Lithuania pay 84 rubles [R] per tonne, and up to this year oil used to cost R30. In the first half of the year the Mazeikiai refinery faced bankcrupcy because,as the price of oil was rising, the Lithuanian Government did not increase the prices of oil products up to the middle of July. On 1 August the enterprise owned to the oil pipeline R60 million. After the government allocated a subsidy, this debt was covered, but since August the prices of oil have increased once again.

Recently the Luthuanian Government rejected a proposal by the Ministry of Economy to increase the prices of oil products. For example, it was intended to increase the price of gasoline to 60-70 kopeks per liter. At present it costs 40-50 kopeks.

All my interlocutors asserted that the price of oil would not increase up to the end of the year. It is difficult to believe this. Russia, too, does not intend to increase the price of oil, but from next year Russia intends to sell oil to us for hard currency. Deputy Minister of Economy Vytas Navickas said that one tonne of black gold will cost Lithuania next year $127. It is difficult to say what price gasoline will be after 1 January. Meanwhile the price of gasoline in Estonia is going up already on 1 November. Gasoline there will cost from 85 kopeks to R1.08.

In Latvia several intertown bus routes have been abolished because of a shortage of gasoline. Lines at gasoline stations are very infrequent there. The shortage of gasoline has compelled the Lithuanan Government, too, to introduce certain limitations. At present not more than 30 liters are sold to each driver, and this qauntity can be put only into the car's tank and not into some additional container. It must be noted that hitherto, feverishly accumulating stocks, the drivers used to pour gasoline into any vessel at hand.

But after the introduction of these limitations, the lines at gasoline stations did not become shorter, maybe because many people are preparing for long journeys tomorrow [All Saints' Day].

Ministry Refutes Press Reports on Unemployment

LD0211201691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Statement issued by the Ministry of Social Insurance; place and date not given]

[Text] Reports have appeared lately in the Lithuanian press—in the 25-31 September issue of POZICIJA and the 27 September issue of RESPUBLIKA—that there were 400,000 unemployed in Lithuania and that about 50,000 persons were using the services of the labor exchange.

The Ministry of Social Insurance announces that this is not true. Since March of this year, after the employment law came into force, the labor exchange was approached by 48,700 persons seeking employment or wishing to change it. By 1 October 1991 the labor exchanges had 5,058 registered persons seeking employment. Unemployment benefits were paid for 2,632 of them. At the same time 14,500 vacancies were registered at the labor exchange.

Such irresponsible public statements misinform the society and, without any foundation, increase social tension.

Belorussia's Shushkevich Gives Vilnius Speech

LD2710223191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1500 GMT 24 Oct 91

[Address by Belorussian Supreme Soviet Chairman S. Shushkevich to Lithuanian parliament in Vilnius; speech in Belorussian with passage by passage translation into Lithuanian; translated from the Belorussian—live]

[Text] Thank you very much, esteemed ladies and gentlemen! For the second time I have an opportunity to speak in the parliament of the Lithuanian Republic. I was your guest for the first time last year as a deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia when you were bravely defending your independence against the putschists who were trying to overthrow the constitutional government of the Lithuanian Republic. Repeated visits by Belorussian parliamentarians to Lithuania helped to find out the truth of events and to convey it to the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia, which resolutely condemned the adventures of force and supported the people of Lithuania in their national-democratic struggle for independence.

Taking the opportunity provided by the honor of being in your parliament today I, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Belorussia, greet the independent Lithuania, its parliament and its people and wish all of you success on the path which you have chosen yourself. I would now like, esteemed chairman, to say to you personally words of deep gratitude for the congratulations and the kind words of goodwill on the occasion of the declaration by the Republic of Belorussia of political and economic sovereignty and on my election to the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia.

Esteemed chairman, it is difficult for Belorussians while in ancient Vilnius to resist the temptation to recall the history of co-existence of our neighbouring peoples, to draw parallels between the past and the present, to make a certain [words indistinct] the Polotsk's Pagonya and the Lithuanian Vytis, our military brotherhood at Grunwald during the uprising of the 1831 and 1833, and to recite something from the masterpieces from our common state-political and legal (?thought), [word indistinct] of the Great Duchy of Lithuania, Russia and (?Zamoysk).

But let's leave philological reminiscences to scientists and publicists. Life brings us back to the present day and rather inclines us to geopolitical reflections. Relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the Republic of Belorussia are not a regional question. They are not even a question of a purely European process in which 38 countries are now officially involved. Belorussia is geographically positioned on the periphery of the former Soviet Union. Nevertheless, considering the fact that a large part of the Armed Forces and weapons, including nuclear ones, of the former Union are still deployed on its territory, the problems of future political orientation of the republic cannot be included in the area of regional

interests of international community. It is a question of time whether in general a real European integration will take place, or whether it will start as the so-called periphery of the former Union or take a path from the so-called center.

The integration which will take place through the immediate neighbors and will link more closely Central and Western Europe with the periphery of the former Union in the first place has the biggest prospect. Here, no doubt, all the various political and economic reforms will work quicker and smoother. The neighborhood of the central and eastern regions of the former Union with other cultural and religious traditions and mentality will (?dictate) different concepts of statehood, military structure and foreign and home policy. Our Supreme Soviet has already made its choice juridically. The declaration of state sovereignty of the Republic of Belorussia has received the status of a constitutional law. It says directly that the Belorussian Republic has the right to its Armed Forces, Internal Troops, and bodies of state and social security subordinated to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Belorussia. The Belorussian Republic sets itself the goal of creating a nuclear-free zone on our territory and turning the republic into a neutral state.

If we follow step by step the letter of this constructive law, then for the Republic of Belorussia the meaning of the transitional period concerning military questions acquires an absolutely (?clear form) [words indistinct]. Our final goal is an integration into the nuclear-free Europe, neutrality, and system of collective security in the system of united nations. Our representatives already made a statement on the future Baltic-Belorussian nuclear-free belt at the UN session last year. The law on democracy in the Republic of Belorussia states that without knowledge of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia neither importation nor redeployment of military contigents may take place at its territory; this means that all questions of deployment and movement of Army detachments, including their subdivisions deployed outside the boundaries of Belorussia, will be solved only with its participation as a sovereign state and not as a part of a certain federation of states.

It is clear that at the talks between the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR the Republic of Belorussia can only be represented as an independent state-member of the economic union and simply as an observer. The questions of our borders with Lithuania and national minorities which I will talk about later in more detail is solely a matter for Lithuania and Belorussia.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen! Today, on United Nations Day, on behalf of the Republic of Belorussia, one of its original members, I sincerely congratulate the Lithuanian Republic on its official membership in this authoritative international organization. Our parliament adopted a resolution on the principles of the foreign policy of the Republic of Belorussia in which it confirmed the adherence of Belorussia to the principles of the UN Charter, the principles of the general declaration of human rights, and the international obligations of the Republic of Belorussia in accordance with international agreements including the international pact on social and political rights and the international pact on economic, social, and cultural rights. Our Supreme Soviet addressed the leaders of the parliaments of the CSCE member-states proposing the admission of the Republic of Belorussia in the capacity of a full member of this conference and to start negotiations on the destruction of nuclear weapons and the declaration of the European continent as a nuclear-free zone.

I hope that in the Lithuanian Republic, now a full member of this conference, the Republic of Belorussia will find support in this sincere aspiration of ours. Our states are interested in this as a vitally important matter.

Esteemed chairman, [words indistinct] seeing that the Lithuanian Republic has already become a full member of the Helsinki process and that the Republic of Belorussia is also embarking on this path, our bilateral relations should be based on the principles of the final act of the CSCE, including the principles of the inviolability of borders. According to this principle, we must regard as inviolable all the borders between ourselves and the boders of all the states in Europe. Therefore we must abstain both now and in the future from any attempts to change these borders. At the same time, as a member-state of the Vienna convention [word indistinct] international agreements of 1969, in particular in accordance with paragraph 1a of Article 69 and the regulations of Article 4 of this convention, the Republic of Belorussia can consider it possible to hold [word indistinct] dialogues with its neighbors on a mutually beneficial basis [words indistinct] the contents and borders of Belorussia, starting with the so-called Brest peace agreement of 1918, then the Riga peace agreement of March 1921, and finally the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939 and the Soviet-Polish agreement of 16 June 1945; these were signed without the participation of Belorussia.

A sensible politician today understands very well the difference between a representative of an ethnic minority who found himself in a certain country as a result of migration processes of recent decades and a person whose ancestors lived in a certain area for centuries but who, under the force of geopolitical circumstances, found himself outside the state borders of his nation but still staying on his ethnic territory. From the point of view of human rights a dual right is active here: the right of an ethnic minority and the right of a representative of an indigenous population [word indistinct].

Last week our Supreme Soviet adopted the law on citizenship of the Republic of Belorussia in accordance with which a citizen of the Republic of Belorussia can have only one citizenship. All the inhabitants of the republic who live in Belorussia permanently at the moment of the law coming into force are declared citizens of the Republic of Belorussia. Citizens whose

fathers and grandfathers were born within the Belorussian borders, or persons who were born outside the present state borders but identify themselves as Belorussians have the right to claim Belorussian citizenship without a seven-year period of permanent residence. I hope that bilateral agreements between Lithuania and Belorussia will help [word indistinct] to solve the questions of property and civic relations. We intend today to sign a declaration on [word indistinct] neighborly relations between the Republic of Belorussia and the Lithuanian Republic. (?The status) recognizes ethnic, cultural and linguistic originality of Belorussians in Lithuania and Lithuanians in Belorussia. (?It) guarantees all the conditions for free development in this originality. There is a good hope that our people in your country and your people in ours will enjoy equal rights and freedoms and also have respective opportunities in education, science,culture and religion.

The views of Mr Vytautas Landsbergis and myself on this problem coincide. They correspond to the spirit of state and international agreements and the principles of good-neighborly relations. I think that the questions of the border, customs, border transit, trade, traffic, foreign citizens and many others will be solved positively in the process of the work of our joint working groups which will allow in the near future the signing of a framework agreement of substance between the Republic of Belorussia and the Republic of Lithuania.

I would like to finish in a lyrical way. I am grateful to you, Mr Chairman, for the invitation to make a speech in your parliament. You are a professor of music and I am a professor of physics and I believe that according to the principle of mutual complements in our personal contacts we will be inspired by harmony and pragmatics. Let them serve for the benefit of the Lithuanian and the Belorussian peoples. Thank you for your attention and patience and forgive me for being unable to make a speech in the Lithuanian language.

Labor Party Denounces 'Harsh Treatment'

LD0311161591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] The council presidium of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party has published a statement which notes that unless attacks against the opposition forces and attempts to do away with this party are halted, the European Parliament and other international organizations will be informed of the harsh treatment of the opposition and the threat posed to democracy in Lithuania.

The statement also expresses the intention to approve the question concerning the withdrawal of deputies who are Democratic Labor Party members from parliament activity, (?holding) a referendum for the dissolution of parliament, and organizing elections to the Seimas.

The statement notes that the document has been adopted following the approval of a draft resolution by the second Lithuanian parliament session on taking over the property of the Lithuanian Communist Party and former communist organizations.

Customs Protocol Signed With Poland

LD0211221991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2230 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Lithuanian and Polish expert groups today signed a bilateral protocol on the movement of citizens across the Lithuanian-Polish border in Vilnius. It was agreed to change radically the system of customs and border control. The persons crossing the border will be checked at joint posts. Thus, a car is expected to be checked in five minutes, whereas now it takes Lithuanian and Polish posts up to two hours, without taking into consideration the time lost in waiting.

Communications will improve after two new transit points are opened on the railways and the roads. Expert groups agreed that the possibility for Polish citizens to enter Lithuania without visas would be considered by the Lithuanian government. Polish officials no longer require visas from Lithuanian citizens going to Poland.

Meanwhile it is reported from the Lazdijai transit point that after various restrictions were imposed by the Lithuanian Government, the tension at this customs and border control post has considerably declined.

Fifth Congress of People's Deputies

Wrap-Up of 1 Nov Congress Proceedings Reported

LD0211081591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 2021 GMT on 1 November broadcast its regularly scheduled "Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies" program, including recorded highlights of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 1 November. The program opened with an unidentified deputy calling for removal of the former "Soviet" red and blue Russian flag. After the day's agenda was approved, the Constitutional Court judges (Luchin) and (Ametistov) were sworn in to their positions.

At 2024 GMT, Mikhail Alekseyevich Mityukov enumerated amendments and addenda to the draft law on the RSFSR Constitution. Deputy Nikiforov, representing the agrarian union, called for an article to be removed. The amendments and addenda enumerated were voted on with speakers from the floor interjecting changes which were also put to vote.

At 2100 GMT, the program was interrupted by a 27-minute edition of the regularly scheduled "Vesti" newscast.

At 2127 GMT, the program resumed with video showing the former Russian flag being removed, while the new tricolor remains.

Deputy Muravyev proposed an amendment to the draft law on the Constitution. RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov asked for a vote at the end of discussion and a decision on the draft law. Mityukov, still at the podium, proposed a last amendment that executive committees of soviets of rayons, krays, cities, and oblasts be replaced with administrations. At 2136 GMT, the draft law was adopted.

At 2137 GMT, a decision on implementing the draft law on amendments and addenda to the Constitution was read by Mityukov and adopted. Khasbulatov thanked Mityukov.

At 2139 GMT, Deputy Zakharov, head of the editorial commission, took the floor. The commission prepared a draft decision on the socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR to be taken as a basis for work, he reported before reading the decision. It approved the president's proposals and called for normative acts and changes to existing legislation to carry out economic reform, Zakharov noted.

At 2142 GMT, the draft decision was adopted. Deputy Bratishchev called for an end to discussion of the decision and for the decision to be voted on; the deputies agreed.

At 2148 GMT, Zakharov read the president's draft decision on organizing executive power during the period of radical economic reform, calling for a ban on elections and for the right to deal independently with questions on reorganizing the RSFSR Government. This was adopted. At 2153 GMT, the draft decision was adopted.

A debate over a draft decision on Ossetia followed. An unidentified deputy underlined that people are being shelled, killed, and wounded. Decisions had been adopted at union and RSFSR level, but the fighting continued, he says before pointing out Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia's statement in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY that the ambiguous Russian position on South Ossetia is hindering relations between Russia and Georgia. Russia's position is quite clear, he noted. At 2200 GMT, the decision was adopted.

It was agreed to vote without discussion on candidates for the post of deputy chairmen of the Congress of People's Deputies. Khasbulatov named the candidates, which he said were chosen on a functional basis. The deputies presented about 20 candidates, of which Khasbulatov chose Sergey Filatov, Yuriy Yarov, Vladimir Shumeyko, and Yuriy Voronin. He said failure to confirm them would signify lack of faith in him. Filatov was voted on as first deputy chairman of the Congress of People's Deputies. Yarov was voted on as deputy chairman. Khasbulatov admitted that he left his voting card somewhere which is why he is not voting. Shumeyko, director of a major enterprise, was voted deputy chairman. Finally, Voronin was also voted deputy chairman of the Congress of People's Deputies.

At 2214 GMT, Georgiy Matyukhin, chairman of the board of the Central Bank of Russia, said he wanted to calm fears of sudden operations encroaching on citizens by the Central Bank, like what happened in the spring. He repeated that there were no such plans. An unidentified deputy asked if the union authorities would repeat such operations, to which Matyukhin replied that the union authorities sometimes prepare economic reform documents behind his back. Matyukhin denied that his Central Bank was engaged in any commercial activity, adding that that has been banned by the law. In response to a question by Deputy Starovoytova, Matyukhin said that the Russian Central Bank has the technical capability to countermand any currency machination by the Union central bank.

At 2224 GMT, the secretary of the tellers' commission confirmed the four candidates as deputy chairmen from the secret ballot. Deputies applauded the four. Khasbulatov thanked the hall for its trust, noting that the protocol of the tellers' commission was now confirmed.

At 2229 GMT, decisions on the appointment of the above were adopted. Khasbulatov congratulated the new deputy chairmen. They took their places on the rostrum with Khasbulatov. A deputy suggested that part of Matyukhin's speech should be shown on "Vremya."

At 2234 GMT, the program ended.

2 Nov Proceedings

LD0211232691

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 2015 GMT on 2 November broadcast its regularly scheduled "Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies" program, including recorded highlights of the last day of the congress session in Moscow on 2 November. The program opened with Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Khasbulatov inviting Filatov, first deputy chairman, to take the floor. On behalf of all other deputy chairman he thanked the deputies and promised to work hard to benefit all.

At 2017 GMT Khasbulatov named the members of the Constitutional Court elected yesterday.

At 2018 GMT Yeltsin delivered a speech on the draft constitution.

At 2041 GMT Khasbulatov invited deputies to start the discussion. Deputy Ambartsumov from the Constitutional Commission described the Commission's work and stressed the strong points of the draft constitution.

At 2047 GMT Deputy Tumov read a statement by deputies from national-territorial formations, maintaining that the draft curtails the rights of small peoples and is unacceptable.

Next, Deputy Grachev said the national state structure set out in the draft is sensible and agrued with the previous speaker. He put forward amendments to the draft and proposed to adopt it.

At 2055 GMT there wass a break in the program to carry the regular "Vesti" newscast.

At 2126 the program resumed. Deputy Polozkov from the Smena faction gave his assessment of the draft. It is unacceptable regarding its pattern of national-state structure, he stated, continuing that creating lands will aggravate administrative chaos. Deputy Nelasov said he is satisfied with the draft in general and offered certain amendments.

At 2135 GMT Deputy Zolotukhin praised the draft, although it needs some amendments. At 2140 GMT Deputy Abdulatipov said small peoples fare badly in the draft constitution and should be given special attention. At 2146 GMT Rumyantsev, secretary of the commission, stressed the strongest points of the draft and proposed to continue working on it. At 2155 GMT Khasbulatov started the voting for the draft; the result was 730 for and 21 against so the vote was adopted.

At 2157 GMT Deputy Filatov took the floor to speak about renewing the Supreme Soviet. He gave the number of vacancies and made proposals concerning the rotation procedure. The announcer noted that after discussion rotation of the Supreme Soviet was approved.

At 2204 GMT there was voting on electing Dorofeyev chairman of the standing orders commission. He was elected.

At 2204 GMT Abdulatipov presented a draft on integrity and indivisibility of the Russian Federation. It specified the delimitation of powers between the Federation and national formations and contained several provisions protecting rights of national minorities, including Russians.

Khasbulatov proposed a new title for the draft and read an appeal of the Soviet of Nationalities to people's deputies of named republics calling on them to conclude special accords guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of national minorities from the Russian Federation residing on their territories.

At 2217 GMT Deputy Serdyukov criticized the wording defining Russian minorities as applicable to the Ukraine. Deputy Pavlov endorsed the previous comment and proposed adopting the appeal.

At 2220 GMT Khasbulatov put the first appeal to a vote, and it was adopted. A second appeal to three republics was also put to a vote and adopted.

At 2221 GMT Khasbulatov asked the deputies to support the Supreme Soviet's decision regarding the illegality of elections in Chechen-Ingushetia. The vote was adopted.

At 2222 GMT Khasbulatov made his concluding speech. He praised the businesslike manner in which the congress was held. The congress approved the main principles of economic reform presented. It can create an important prerequisite for finding a way out of the crisis. We need national reconciliation today more than anything, he said.

Khasbulatov said we must distinguish between long- and short-term tasks for implementing economic reform. The mistakes of the center should be avoided. We welcome the president's intention to invite specialists at all levels of implementing reform. We are worried by relations with the Ukraine, and mistakes committed should be corrected. Relations with the newly emerging states around Russia should be based on international law. Finally, Khasbulatov thanked everybody who prepared the congress.

The program ended at 2235 GMT.

Khasbulatov News Conference on Congress

LD0111151591 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Oct 91

[News conference by Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov to correspondents identified by screen caption; place and date not given; from the "Vesti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Khasbulatov] In a few words I could say that for at least two days you have been observing that the congress is progressing quite fruitfully, and the very complex issues we had to tackle have been solved in a dynamic and competent way, on the whole. Of course, to a great degree this is linked with the fact that deputies who have arrived from localities and provinces come across very large socioeconomic problems—the impoverishment of our population and its growing discontent, which affects all parts of organizations and administration, legislative and representative bodies, executive bodies, specific individuals, deputies, and members of government. Under these conditions, what the population expects from the deputies is not long discourses or theoretic deliberations but concrete decisions and, if possible, a shorter congress. Therefore, it seems to me that yesterday and today the deputies have been working very efficiently, and there have been few routine speeches, tedious passages, issues not related to the agenda, or abstract discourses. Such things occur less and less frequently.

[Unidentified correspondent] Ruslan Imranovich, you repeated a couple of times yesterday that you have very interesting schemes regarding the economy in the Supreme Soviet and that they can help the president to solve those tasks which we are now facing. Could you tell us briefly what those schemes are and how you are going to integrate them into the president's program?

[Khasbulatov] Well as for the schemes, I suppose it would be rather boring if I were to talk about the foundations of economic policy and strategy at this news conference, but there are... [changes thought] What are those industries? Let us say a financial and banking recovery, the circulation of money so that we can stop this senseless issuance of money. Well there are some interesting things here. That is exactly what I was talking about. Some schemes consider cooperation with foreign capital—the elimination or at least reduction of our foreign debt. There are some good schemes there. Then there are some very unusual approaches to privatization issues. Generally speaking, we have some schemes in the Supreme Soviet regarding the major blocks of the most acute issues. Some specialists who work with the Supreme Soviet and its leadership have some good ground work which will, no doubt, enrich the president's progam. What I meant was this: At this very complicated stage, it is important for us not to be happy with the fact that the president takes upon himself such a complex responsibility as premiership when we have no further retreat and there is nothing to cushion us, as it were, but to involve the parliament and the Supreme Soviet in implementing business, in taking responsibility, and in not pointing out failures, so to speak. This is very important.

It seems to me that the time of all those quarrels, mindless accusations, and counteraccusations should fade away. Maybe we do not quite realize this, but we are at a dangerous line, a very dangerous line. You see, first the so-called socialist camp and then the Soviet Union disintergated, and now it is a question of erosion already in the Russian Federation. One should understand this. Incidentally, it is no mere coincidence—I have seen that the NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA has already raised the issue that allegedly there are intentions to limit freedom of the press. Of course it is not so; nobody in the Russian parliament wants to limit freedom of the press, but I have been friendly with newspapers, journalists, with your kind—you are fanning up the flames of national enmity in the Russian Federation. You are covering events unprofessionally and primitively, whereas particular care and particular professionalism are required. It looks as if some of you were happy about those flames emerging. Some shady characters are being hailed as almost national heroes and so on. Can one work in such a way? I am absolutely convinced that the major part of the nutrient medium, the ground for General Dudayev's regime in Chechen-Ingush, more than half of it can be explained by the support given by the press and television. It could be unintentional support, but looking for sensations journalists fail to grasp what is going on over there, but they are eager to provide a sensation, some hot fact. One must not work in such a way. Let us cooperate.

[Aleksandr Kokotkin from STUDINFORM] Ruslan Imranovich, you have just said that you have certain economic preparations for reforming executive power that you are going to submit...

[Moderator, interrupting] You are repeating a question.

[Kokotkin] No, I am not asking about that. It is known that before his speech Yeltsin said in the lobby: I will act as a kamikaze, but I have no other choice. You are regarded as Yeltsin's man. If the reform fails and the corresponding consequences for the Cabinet of Ministers and the president ensue, are you personally prepared to share responsibility for this?

[Khasbulatov] Good heavens! Do I not bear responsibility for my acts and decisions every day? In case of failure, of course I am prepared; there is nothing to talk about here. How can we not bear responsibility?

[Moderator] Your question, please.

[Grigoriy Kroshin from STOLITSA magazine] Ruslan Imranovish, do you feel orphaned since your two brave deputies have left? Does this fall within the limits of the idea you have propounded more than once to the effect that there is no need for you to breed your own opposition? Is there any need for deputy chairmen in the future RSFSR Supreme Soviet? Thank you.

[Khasbulatov] Deputy chairmen are necessary, by all means. Regarding the circumstance that two deputies handed in official notices, they, naturally, sumbitted those notices following their inner conviction. They probably understood that it would be better, perhaps, to hand in such notices than not to hand them in, following the principle of Lycurgus. Regarding my assertion about whether we should breed opposition, you seem to be referring to what was said during the formation of the

USSR Supreme Soviet. Do you see anything subversive here? Seriously, why should one breed opposition for himself? It will emerge by itself, without my participation. There is no need for me to build it with my own hands. I need my hands for other, more useful things. So I do not see any logic in your assertions.

[Nikolay Gorenyuk from PROLOG] Ruslan Imranovich, you are an economist. Did you personally take part in developing the new economic course set out in the president's address yesterday?

[Khasbulatov] No, naturally I...

[Gorenyuk, interrupting] What is your position, then? Do you agree with the directions proposed by the president yesterday?

[Khasbulatov] You see, yesterday it was not an economic program, after all. The president himself described it as an address to the congress, to the people. It contained certain parts—it is another matter that the president is drafting programs and that certain draft decisions are being prepared. Of course when it is a question of our collective joint responsibility—that of the parliament and the president—we will, of course, propose our view of these problems. After all, we, the parliament, must create a kind of free legal field for the president's activity.

[Unidentified correspondent from IZVESTIYA in Kolomna, Moscow Oblast] I have to travel in the oblast very often, and residents are worried about the following: Currently, in localities, profiting by the impotence of numerous incapable soviets, the former party nomenclature is creating associations of entrepreneurs. In fact, they are laying their hands on town property. There is the danger that these associations will control the creation of rival firms and enterprises. I would like to ask whether the Russian Supreme Soviet is taking into account such a situation in its work—I believe that it is typical in the country—and, if possible, how can this be overcome?

[Khasbulatov] You see, the Supreme Soviet, the parliament, is a legislative body. The thing that you have mentioned is, unfortunately, a very powerful tendency which is developing not only in Moscow Oblast but throughout the country. Why has it emerged? What has initiated it and allowed it to acquire such threatening dimensions? It is a result of the inaction of executive power, a result of the fact that not very good... [changes thought] Many people are saying that many of our good laws do not operate. Well I would say that the laws—maybe even not very good ones—that we have adopted in the sphere of privatization, enterprise, private activity, promotion of small enterprises, and many other things, very many laws and decisions are not being effected by executive power. Consequently, a certain vacuum is taking shape, and this vacuum is being filled by these parasitic forms of private ownership and corporate ownership, including the so-called shareholders, associations, or concerns.

What was the situation before? There was a powerful ministry, say, controlling 200 state enterprises. It was clear-cut; it was clear that it was a state ministry, a state sector made up of 200 enterprises, and all of a sudden this ministry became a concern. It is not clear who this property belongs to, what kind of property this is. Then again a transformation takes place and some other form of ownership is announced. Former directors and managers of state enterprises begin to claim these enterprises, firms, works, and factories as if they were their property. Just imagine what is taking place! A parasitic-bureaucratic privatization is taking place on a very large scale, and it is rapidly merging with criminal forces. It is appearing not only on Russia's territory but also is beginning to establish far-reaching links with foreign countries by controlling raw materials exchange, etc. Why is all this taking place? Because executive power is either unprofessional, completely inactive, or both. Unfortunately, this is so. The parliament is, of course, a great force, but it is legislative power. Lately we have been striving to use control functions of supreme legislative power more fully, but these control functions will never take the place of a professionally working executive apparatus and government.

[Moderator] Move closer to the microphone, please, but it should be a question.

[Second unidentified correspondent] On behalf of all the mothers and our children we cordially congratulate you on your election and hope very much that your election will help us to survive in these conditions of terrible inflation. Newborn babies are already being named after you, including the newborn son of our president of the Fund of Families With Many Children. We would like the protection of family interests to be the top item on the government program and believe the family should remain the basic value. After all, the family is everything; there is no future without children. [She gives Khasbulatov a bunch of red roses; applause]

[Khasbulatov] Thank you very much.

Deputies Question Gorbachev's Credit Request

PM0411112391 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Nov 91 First Edition p 1

["Commentary" by Vladimir Sluzhakov: "So, Why Does Gorbachev Need 30 Billion?"]

[Text] After the Russian president had expounded his plan for energetic transition to the market at the congress, without concealing the fact that we will have to go through by no means the best of times in the struggle against inflation, the USSR president suddenly found himself in urgent need of 30 billion rubles. He addressed the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet with a request that it ratify his decision that the USSR State Bank should grant the USSR Ministry of Finances until 31 December credits worth the designated sum.

When this fact was made public at the congress, it provoked a stormy reaction. It is worth recalling the efforts that were required to get the Law on the Indexation of the Population's Incomes through parliament, a law which is designed to protect the most disadvantaged citizens. What weighty objections were there, although it involved a much smaller sum to implement; though even this money is capable of exacerbating inflationary processes.

A deputies' question was submitted to the RSFSR president, signed by four RSFSR people's deputies: S. Krasavchenko, Yu. Voronin, M. Dmitriyev, and B. Kurkov. The document says, in particular, that it is difficult to agree to this measure without full information about how the Union center planned to distribute the requested credit, the sources to be used to pay it off, and the sources to be used to put together the required sum of credit.

First, the deputies requested that the congress be given information on this question promptly, and second, they demanded that an appeal be made to the USSR president and that his decision on the credit be suspended pending coordination with the RSFSR.

Sergey Krasavchenko, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Economic Reforms and Property and one of the authors of the deputies' question, commented on the situation as follows: M. Gorbachev has in effect already given this sum to the USSR Ministry of Finance and now asks only for it to be ratified.

There are fears that these resources will go to pay for the central ministries and departments whose finances ceased as of 1 November by Yeltsin's decree. Russia will provide this money, and Gorbachev, as has happened more than once, will dispose of it in his own fashion.

All this is happening at a most crucial and decisive time for the republic. Let us recall that a year ago the Russian Government was provoked into raising purchase prices which in turn stimulated the growth of retail prices. The printing presses started going, and inflation began. On whose backs will the burden of this credit fall? The president says confidently: We will pay it off by 31 December. How? The money will be splashed out now, just when Yeltsin is planning to launch a tough austerity program.

Deputies Pass Law on Constitutional Changes

OW0111231491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1524 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Republic's Congress of Peoples' Deputies passed a law on Friday [1 November] on changes and additions to the Republic's Constitution. According to the law in the Constitution, specific articles are included on the administratiwe head and on the formation of a professional parliament. Twice the ammendment was declined that the speakers of chambers of the Supreme Soviet be deputy chairmen of the Russian Supreme Soviet.

The congress decided not to look into the question of changing the name of the Republic to Russia. Ruslan Khasbulatov, in a comment on this last decision, remarked that the decision was entirely correct, and, taking into account the possible reactions of other republics, he noted that "we could, together with a change of name, slide into an economic abyss."

Georgia Urged To Resolve Ossetia Conflict

LD0111184191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1717 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow 1 Nov (TASS)—The Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies suggested today that the Georgian leadership should take urgent measures to resolve the conflict in South Ossetia and ensure normal living conditions for the local population. A resolution adopted by the congress also instructed the president and the parliament of Russia to take all necessary measures, including strict economic sanctions, if the Georgian leadership fails to settle the conflict and to restore human rights in South Ossetia. The congress also suggested that the RSFSR Council of Ministers should sue Georgia for the amount of money which had to be spent on helping the refugees from South Ossetia to North Ossetia, which is part of the RSFSR.

According to Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Russian parliament, Russia has already spent about 80 million rubles on resettling 100,000 refugees from South Ossetia. "This is aggression against the sovereign Russian Federation," he stressed. "The Georgian Government must compensate for the expenses suffered by the RSFSR." The congress appealed to the USSR president, the union Ministry of Defense and Interior Ministry, to propose measures within their power, for stabilization of the situation in South Ossetia.

Resolution on Sanctions Passed

OW0211024591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia's Congress of People's Deputies has passed a resolution proposing that the Federation's President and Supreme Soviet should take necessary measures including tough economic sanctions against Georgia to restore human rights and settle the conflict in Southern Ossetia.

To avoid the sanctions Georgia's leadership should stop the activities of illegal para-military units, remove the road blocks, return refugees to normal life, and provide normal conditions for the population.

The speaker of the House of Nationalities Ramazan Abdulatipov warned that "real agression is being aimed at the Russian Federation" to whose terrtory (in Northern Ossetia) about 100,000 Ossetian refugees have fled from Georgia costing over 80 mn rubles in upkeep. Some deputies suggest charging the sum to Tbilisi.

Draft on Reorganizing Executive Rule Passed

OW0111194391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1748 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After a recess on Friday [1 November], the Russian Congress of Peoples' Deputies passed a draft of the decree on executive powers during radical economic reforms. The decree is in power from the moment of approval until December 1, 1992.

Originally, during a clause-by-clause debate of the draft, state councillor Sergey Shakhray declared that he had been given authority by Yeltsin to end discussion of the draft entirely, since further debate of the president's document was "pointless," as the second point had been changed by the deputies.

Discussion did not end, however, and as a result of the ensuing debate, they reached a compromise.

The goals of the decree are to guarantee the stability of the systems of government power and management in the Russian Republic; to put off elections on all levels for representatives to state executive organs until December 1, 1992, except for elections of Peoples' Deputies to replace those who have quit, elections for president, and elections to the Supreme Soviet of the republics, as these elections were decided on at an earlier date.

In the framework of the means allotted by the Supreme Soviet until the corresponding laws have been passed, the decree gives the Russian president the right to decide questions of reorganization and formation of the highest organs of executive power in counties, regions, autonomous republics, cities and areas of the republic. Until elections can be held for the top administrative positions, the president may appoint people to them, or he may appoint an administrative head at the highest level in agreement with the corresponding Councils of Peoples' Deputies and taking into account the opinions of the peoples' deputies of the Russian Republic and the corresponding territories.

During the period of radical reforms it has been recommended that the Supreme Soviet refrain from referendums which concern the Russian Republic.

During this period all lower executive organs are entirely subordinated to the higher organs, which may repeal any decisions which do not correspond to the laws of the Russian Republic, normative acts, or the direction which economic reforms are taking.

Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairmen Elected

LD0111211791 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—Four deputies of the Russian parliament chairman were elected during this afternoon's meeting of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. All four were nominated by parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov:

Sergey Filatov, who acted as secretary of the Presidium of the Russian parliament until today, was elected first deputy. Yuriy Yarov was elected deputy chairman in charge of work with local councils. Vladimir Shumeiko will be responsible for the enactment of economic reform. Yuriy Voronin will be in control over the implementation of decisions made by parliament sessions and meetings of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

All four deputies were elected by an overwhelming majority.

Draft Decision on Socioeconomic Situation Noted

LD0211124891 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2139 GMT 1 Nov 91

["Draft Decision of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic [RSFSR] on the Social and Economic Situation in the RSFSR" as read by Mikhail Mikhaylovich Zakharov, chairman of the editorial commission, at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow on 1 November; from the "Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies" program—recorded]

[Text] Draft Decision of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] on the Social and Economic Situation in the RSFSR:

Having considered the president's appeal to the people of the RSFSR and the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies and having discussed the social and economic situation in the Republic, the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies resolves as follows:

1. to approve the main principles of economic reform as set out in the RSFSR president's appeal;

2. to draw the RSFSR president's attention to the RSFSR Council of Minister's failure to fulfill a number of decisons of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The RSFSR president and RSFSR Government must adopt normative acts by

1 January 1992 ensuring the implementation of previously adopted RSFSR legislative acts dealing with the pursuit of economic reform;

3. the RSFSR Supreme Soviet must make the relevant changes to existing RSFSR legislation by 1 January 1992 and also adopt laws necessary for ensuring economic reform under a list agreed with the RSFSR president;

4. in implementing economic reforms, the bodies of state power must ensure the observance of RSFSR legislation. The improvement of legislation must be effected in the framework of procedures established in the RSFSR Constitution;

5. to consider the progress of economic reform at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in March-April 1992.

Bank Chairman Comments on Withdrawing Banknotes

LD0111221291 Moscow TASS in English 2159 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—Chairman of the Board of Russia's Central Bank Georgiy Matykhin resolutely denied rumours alleging that 50- and 100-ruble banknotes are to be replaced or withdrawn from circulation. Speaking at the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies he assured the Russian people that the republic's central bank has no intention to introduce measures once used by former premier Valentin Pavlov and called upon everybody to "stay calm". "We are not planning any surgical operations infringing on the interests of Russian people," he told parliament members. But he refused to give similar assurances concerning the USSR Gosbank.

'Text' of Yeltsin Report on Draft Constitution

LD0211144191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1040 GMT 2 Nov 91

["Text" of report on draft constitution delivered by Boris Yeltsin to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 2 November]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Nov (TASS)— Esteemed people's deputies! As you know, the first Congress of People's Deputies set up a Constitutional Commission numbering 102 people. The commission set up working and expert groups. The congress decided to instruct the commission to compile a draft of the new constitution. In August 1990, a concept of the draft was submitted, while the working basis of a new constitution was ready by the beginning of October. Following its elaboration and by a decision of the commission, the first variant was published in the press in November 1990.

The work on the draft constitution became open to all who wished to assist in it—to deputies, to the public, and to state bodies. Many criticisms and proposals were received from committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet, from deputies, experts, specialists, public organizations, and citizens. They were processed with the help of an automated information technology system and then were subjected to careful expert study.

The Constitutional Commission put forward the initiative to discuss the draft in major judicial centers of the country, in labor collectives, and at meetings of citizens. Many sociological opinion polls were carried out among the population. The commission called in a wide circle of specialists to carry out expert studies of the draft as a whole and also of individual articles and sections of it.

At the same time work was carried out on alternative drafts. The most significant of these were prepared by the "Communists of Russia" group and a group of scholars from Saratov Law Institute.

In January-February 1991 work was carried out to bring the articles of the basic draft constitution closer to the articles of the alternative variants. It was not easy to do this. The basic differences were chiefly ideological in character—the question of the administrative, ethnic structure of Russia, which still arouses serious quarrels and is contradictory in character. The draft prepared by the Constitutional Commission was not oriented on the ideas of socialism and communism. This in itself aroused a sharply negative reaction and still does. Constructive work was constantly blocked by ultimatums and boycotts. Criticism of the articles and ideas resulted, in practice, in a fierce struggle against the draft of the new constitution as a whole.

The situation changed somewhat after the defeat of the putsch in August. The final version of the draft is published in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA and is brought to the attention of people's deputies.

As a whole, it seems that the commission has drawn up a fairly strong document, and it is now already possible and necessary to enter the final stage of its discussion and adoption.

Esteemed people's deputies! Constitutional reform on a grand scale is long overdue. The course that was chosen of strengthening the constitutional foundations of our state by making amendments to the existing constitution was suitable until August. Now, of course, it is no longer very suitable. It is exhausted. However much we change its individual articles and clauses, the spirit and the sense of the Basic Law under which Russia still lives remain as they were before. A constitution adopted in a totalitarian state and meant to uphold its unshakeability cannot be the basis for a new reform course whose goal is a civilized and democratic society. This constitution has become a brake on our political course. It is an obstacle in the way of the radical reforms that are today vitally necessary for Russia and its inhabitants.

The ambiguity of the constitution preserves the soil for all kinds of criminal alternatives after the pattern of the August version. They stimulate political chaos and confusion and lower trust in the state.

It became obvious today that the vigorously proceeding law-making process has entered into blatant contradiction with the norms of the constitution in force. This distorts the legal basis of our society, places time bombs under the construction of a law-governed state, and stimulates legal nihilism. Corrosion not only of legal but also of moral regulators is intensifying. This is extremely dangerous, as the major foundations of the life of society and of the citizen are being undermined. In order to understand the depth of the constitutional crisis in the country, it suffices to turn to the text itself of the fundamental law in force. Today it has turned into a conglomerate of mutually exclusive norms, capable only of disorienting people. I am convinced that if we do not remove these contradictions, it will be considerably more difficult to ensure stability and preserve civil peace in the period of fundamental transformations and radical reforms.

Esteemed people's deputies! The Constitutional Commission's aim in working on the draft was to prepare a fundamental document for a long-term future which will not be outdated in a couple years. The draft submitted to you is geared for the future and has a profoundly innovative nature. It contains secure legal guarantees against totalitarianism, against the supremacy of ideologies, and against violence elevated to the rank of state policy. The new draft constitution does not so much enshrine relations and institutions that have taken shape but lays a legal basis for constructing them and the foundation for transformations. The draft inherits the strong constitutional traditions that were taking shape in our country at the dawn of the 20th century. Its foundation is based on the Russian humane traditions that have taken shape over the centuries and on the achievements of domestic democratic thought. The great wealth of world experience was seriously considered during the working out of this document.

I would like to note specifically the existence of a certain connection between the new constitution and its predecessors. Despite known shortcomings, they had quite a few successful points, they enshrined some fundamental constitutional principles, and it would have been simply senseless to cast them aside in creating the new draft constitution. The draft put forward by the Constitutional Commission places people, above all, at the center of political and legal life. Its speciality lies in this. For the first time ever, the Russian constitution leaves the principle of subordinating a human being to the aims of the state in the understanding of this issue—not to the CPSU or to any other party; it is not a nation but a human being himself who is most important. His rights are unshakeable and inalienable. They are given to him at birth and have the highest priority.

The observance of human rights is the main duty of state authorities, all its institutions, and its officials. The relevant chapter of the draft constitution has been made to correspond as much as possible with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international pacts and treaties. According to the draft constitution, the foundation of the Russian Republic will be a modern market economy involving a variety of forms of ownership and equal protection for these forms. At the same time, in the interests of society, the state takes part in regulating economic life. The constitution vests it with obligations concerning social protection for the citizens. The social partnership relations between citizen and state, consumer and producer, employee and employer are being legislatively enshrined. The preservation of civic peace in the country is one of the most important duties of the state.

The chapter devoted to Russia's federative structure has been giving rise and continues to give rise to heated debates. A simple fact, known to everyone, of the real existence of the Russian state and the real union of its peoples within it, is at the basis of this chapter. It took ages for Russia to take shape, and there should now be no problem over its makeup. The commission proceeded from the fact that our state is a constitutional, rather than a treaty-based federation. Russia's state sovereignty as a unified state is enshrined in the draft constitution.

At the same time, we have only to achieve normal federal relations, and that can be done by harmonizing positions, both from above and below. The draft constitution does not contradict, but on the contrary presupposes the presence of a substantive treaty base, both between the subjects of the federation and between the Russian Federation and each of its subjects. The present draft facilitates rather than hinders the conclusion of a federal treaty. Without it, it is impossible to attain balanced relations or precise guarantees for protection of the sovereignty both of the Russian republics and of Russia as a whole.

The draft envisages two categories of subjects of the federation: republics and lands [zemli], which has given rise to very great arguments. Today there is no unity regarding the understanding of their status in constitutional law: some propose that a higher status should be given to the republics, others favor equal status. I think that the idea of equal status can be accepted if it is understood not as a demand for unification and uniformity but as the need for equal fundamentals in constitutional law for the optimal development of the subjects of the federation, bearing in mind their traditions, local conditions, ethnic composition, etc.

I believe that when drawing up the final formulations one can proceed from the following: First, human rights must be guaranteed throughout Russia. Second, a unified Russia must be preserved. Third, the constitutional system of the republics must not run counter to the constitution of the Russian Federation.

I want to stress that here we are dealing not with a sociopolitical but with a constitutional system. Many questions arise from the term "zemlya." In this a foreign borrowing can be seen. Even though it dates back to ancient Russian, it is intended to form "zemli" on the basis of the existing krays and oblasts, or through joining them. It is a matter primarily of enshrining in the constitution the process of the regional consolidation which is taking place in practice. Unions within the framework of the Far East, Siberia, the Urals, the center of Russia, the northwest, etc., have already become a reality. The mutual attraction of neighboring oblasts, rayons, and okrugs toward each other, and the formation of their union, is quite natural. It is proceeding on the basis of common interests for the sake of mutual benefit.

There are no grounds for seeing this process as some kind of dismemberment of Russia. The strategic powers placed within the remit of the Russian center make it possible to prevent this and to ensure the necessary political unity of the federation.

Apart from that, the establishment of zemlyas creates the requisite material and organizational basis for them to be given the appropriate organizational and legal status.

At the same time the present draft constitution does not propose an artificial acceleration of this process. The intention above all is to organize it properly and provide it with legal regulation. The draft constitution explicitly lays down that regions can acquire the status of zemlya only if they are capable of fully performing the obligations of subjects of the federation. Of late, the suggestion has sometimes been heard that Russia should be artificially divided into a number of large subjects and that national republics should be eliminated altogether. That is without question an erroneous view. Personally, I am categorically opposed to this proposal, and these ideas have not been incorporated in the draft constitution. In it, existing republics are recognized as subjects of the Russian Federation by right. I am convinced that following the numerous violations and distortions in the nationalities policy, such an approach will be the only just one.

The consistent deideologization, renunciation of any preferences in politics, and a strict antidoctrinal thrust represent a most important distinguishing feature of the new draft. The draft constitution rests upon the fact that Russia is a presidential republic. The results of the first Russian referendum became a decisive argument in favor of it. No part of society, no association, and no individual can arrogate power in the state to themselves. A usurpation of state power is a most serious crime. The president is the highest head of state and head of the executive authority in the Russian Federation, while the executive authority itself is seen as a single, coordinated, and functioning vertical structure. According to the draft constitution, the president has a certain independence from the parliament, and there is no threat of being removed due to chance factors hanging over him.

This is a guarantee of the stability and viability of the state, particularly at critical times in its history, but a presidential republic can only function if the principle of the division of the legislative, executive, and judicial authorities is in operation. Each one of them is functioning independently, providing a system of checks and balances for each other and interacting among themselves.

Legal norms ensuring a real power and prestige of the legislative authority are set down in the draft constitution. The Supreme Soviet is a body of legislative authority within the framework of the entire Russian Federation. The president's activity gets powerful legal and organizational counterbalances, which are a guarantee for society against any abuses on the part of the highest state figure. The Supreme Soviet has the right to dismiss the president and other officials in exceptional circumstances.

The draft constitution provides for fundamental judicial reform, as a result of which a strong judicial authority will be created. The stage is drawing to a close when judges were an obedient technical link of the punitive bodies, satisfying the will of the partocracy. The other day Russia's parliament approved the concept of judicial reform and the Fifth Congress elected the Constitutional Court. Thus, the process of transformations which are being enshrined in the constitution is already in progress. The fundamental feature of the draft is the presence in it of the "civil society" section. A full-fledged civil society is a major guarantee against the revival of totalitarianism. It encompasses diverse public relations and institutions: economic, sociopolitical, culture, family and everyday life, and others. The mass media system is a special component of the civil society. Enshrined in the constitution for the first time is the principle of insubordination of these diverse phenomena to the structures and commands of the state. The subjects which make up the civil society are legally independent of one another and interact as equal partners. The principle—a citizen is permitted everything that has not been banned by law—is the leading principle.

The concept of a law-based state was further elaborated in the draft of the constitution. This concept envisages the supremacy of law; direct application of constitutional norms; acceptance of the principles and norms of international law and of international treaties as part of Russian Federation law; the principle of separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers; the delimitation of plenary powers between the Russian Federation and its subjects; and the principle of a multiparty system and ideological pluralism.

Therefore, the draft of this document contains a systematic vision of the democratic, state, and social structure of Russia, and it lays a foundation for law-making.

The adoption of the new constitution will enable the RSFSR to enter the world community as an equal,

peace-loving member and will be a considerable step in the movement of our state along the path of civilization and progress.

Esteemed people's deputies! The work on the draft constitution was an organic part of the whole law-making process in Russia. In the course of the work, account was taken of the main provisions of the 50 important laws adopted recently by the RSFSR and the Union Supreme Soviets. The draft constitution is a unique result of the first stage in the creation of the rule-of-law state.

At the same time, it is proposing a plan for the forthcoming law- making activity. The draft constitution contains references to almost 40 laws. Some of them have already been adopted, and others will be adopted in the future. They are called upon to enrich the provisions of the new constitution. The legislative basis will have to be created to underpin the processes of the reconstruction of the organs of state and the improvement of the administrative-territorial divisions of local self-administration. Their adoption will enable the legislative basis, particularly of agrarian, military, and court reforms, etc., to be considerably strengthened.

At the same time, many of the norms in the proposed draft are ahead of their time and will not be able to function from the moment the document is adopted in full. It is not possible to guarantee immediately all human rights provided for in the new constitution. It is not possible to build a new system of power and heal the economy overnight.

Proceeding from this, the text of the draft constitution includes some transitional provisions which have been designed for the period while the new public relations and institutions are taking shape. It has been envisaged that the transitional provisions will have the same judicial force as the other norms of the main law. This will enable the constitution to be enforced from the moment it is adopted as the act taking immediate effect.

Assessing the work of the Constitutional Commission as a whole, I would like to say the following: A great and important period for Russia is coming to an end. Interruptions and shortcomings have, of course, been identified in the work of the commission. The RSFSR now has the opportunity to obtain a lasting basic document—a constitution—already in the near future. Considerable changes have been under way in Russia while the Constitutional Committee has been at work. Life itself has removed divergencies between various versions of the draft. The main provisions of the draft have been broadly taken on board by public opinion. The last survey of public opinion has shown that an understanding of the importance of this issue and of the need for the adoption of the new constitution is growing.

I think that artificially dragging out the constitutional reform would be a great political mistake. We have no right to let slip the opportunity to put a constitutional barrier on the road of chaos and disintegration. The time has come for the Congress to define its attitude toward the draft constitution. The Congress could decide to instruct committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet to discuss within the next few months any amendments which are still outstanding, and to bring the work on the draft to a completion. The matter of running the state—a most important matter—must, at long last, gain a firm and permanent basis, and be carried on in well-defined interaction with the bodies of the Russian parliament. It is evidently also possible to think of a general referendum on the adoption of the draft of the new constitution. Thank you.

Views 'Divided' on Yeltsin Address

LD0211122591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] At the start of the bulletin we have news from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies. Nikolay Artemev will fill you in.

[Artemev] Today the deputies addressed the work of the Constitutional Commission, which has submitted its draft of the constitution of the Russian Federation. On behalf of the Constitutional Commission, its chairman, RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin, spoke. He said that work on the draft had taken place with the participation of leading specialists over a long time. The alternative points of view of the many drafters have been taken into account. The draft had been subjected to criticism already over the fact that it was not oriented toward socialism and communism, but after the August events, such opposition ceased.

The president stressed that in the matter of drawing up and adopting Russia's new constitution, it is necessary to enter the finishing stretch. The current RSFSR constitution—whatever amendments and addenda we make to it—does not change its essence: it remains the constitution of a totalitarian state and cannot operate during the period of the coming into being of a civilized society. In this way we have a constitutional crisis. Russia's present constitution has become a hindrance. The draft constitution which has been submitted looks to the future and is profoundly innovative, Boris Yeltsin said. Preserving civil peace in the country and guarding the civil rights of the country's citizens will be the state's major obligation.

The president dwelt in detail on the draft's section regarding the national state system, having stressed that the sovereignty of Russia as a unified state is being consolidated. At the same time the question of eliminating national republics is not being raised at all. Lands as an element of the territorial system will reflect the striving toward regional consolidation. The president drew attention to the need for a single agreed vertical executive power structure, which is envisaged by the draft, and stressed the importance and unshakeability of the principle of the division of powers.

In conclusion, Boris Yeltsin said that in the next few months it would be possible to examine and put the

finishing touches on the Constitutional Commission and submit it for examination by the next congress. It would also be possible to examine the question of a referendum on the constitution.

After Yeltsin's address, the debate started. Views were divided, and both supporters and opponents of the draft spoke. The latter discerned in it, in particular, an encroachment on the rights of the small people, and in the next few minutes a vote is to take place regarding the draft constitution of the Russian Federation and the further work of the Constitutional Commission. If this decision is adopted, the Constitutional Commission and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will be instructed to put the finishing touches on the draft constitution submitted to the Congress and to submit it for examination to the next RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

This is the news so far from the Great Kremlin Palace, where the Russian Congress of People's Deputies is working. Nikolay Artemev, the news service.

Emergence of 'Constructive Opposition' Viewed

LD0211140391 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—"The main specific feature of the Fifth Congress of Russian People's Deputies, which wraps up its proceedings in the Kremlin today, is that the former bitter confrontation between groups, first and foremost between the Communists of Russia and Democratic Russia, has vanished and the opposition of a new type is being formed—a constructive opposition with the radical democrats and change—new policy groups as its backbone," Sergey Yushenkov, leader of radical democrats, said at a news conference in the Kremlin, devoted to the preliminary results of the congress.

Developing this idea, he emphasised the Communists of Russia and Democratic Russia groups "actually acted in alliance, which is very surprising", on the key issues on the congress's agenda—the launching of radical reforms and extension of additional powers to Boris Yeltsin. Radical democrats voiced discordant views on the two issues because "Yeltsin does not have a specific plan of reforms".

Change—new policy group leader Andrey Golovin supported Sergey Yushenkov in these assessments of the change in the alignment of forces because he thinks all groups of the congress "are going in one direction. There are no virulent opponents of reforms but there are disagreements about the methods of carrying them through."

At the news conference, representatives of the Democratic Russia group were against this formulation of the issue. Vyacheslav Volkov said "Democratic Russia set as its goal to assist Boris Yeltsin in implementing reforms, and Communists of Russia want Boris Yeltsin, now vested with additional powers, to scuttle reforms, following which 'it will be their time to act'". He emphasised the Democratic Russia bloc "on the whole, evaluated positively the results of the congress's work."

Zorkin Elected Constitutional Court Chairman

LD0211172791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1400 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Excerpts] [Yuriy Klimov] Now with reports from the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] is our parliamentary correspondent Nikolay Artemev.

[Artemev] Esteemed listeners, we had counted on reporting to you the end of the work of the congress approximately an hour ago, but the work has continued. This can be explained by the importance of questions submitted for examination by the deputies. [passage omitted]

The congress decided on renewing a portion of the Soviet of the Republic and of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet. Having examined the draft declaration of the rights and liberties of the individual and of the citizen, submitted by the president, the congress decided to instruct the Supreme Soviet to examine it and to adopt the appropriate decision. The deputies have just adopted an appeal to the supreme soviets of the sovereign republics to protect the rights of the Russian-speaking population in these republics. A decision was adopted declaring illegal the elections in the Chechen-Ingush Republic. Then the deputies were informed of the questions addressed to the congress, and the following curious fact was cited: On behalf of the Agrarian Union, a request had come in to change the measures to secure the court appearance of defendant Starodubtsov [putsch member].

The work of the Fifth Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is drawing to a conclusion. At present the concluding address is being made by Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and at this point I end my live report from the Great Kremlin Palace. Nikolay Artemev, the news service.

[Klimov] Thank you, Nikolay. In addition to his report I will say that today Moscow jurist Valeriy Zorkin was elected chairman of Russia's constitutional court. This was reported at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies by Ruslan Khasbulatov, the chairman of the republican parliament. The constitutional court is a new institution of power in Russia. It is designed to see that legislative acts and actions of officials are in accordance with the republic's constitution. This court is only entitled to render a verdict on the constitutionality of the RSFSR president's actions. Valeriy Zorkin is 48 years old. He is a doctor of juridical science, professor at the higher juridical correspondence school of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry. He took an active part in drawing up the draft of Russia's new constitution.

'Russia' Faction Calls for Talks With Baltics

OW0211170291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1430 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The parliamentary faction "Russia" has appealed to the 5th Congress of Russian People's Deputies to form a group of Russian people's deputies to be included in the Soviet delegation for holding talks with the Baltic states or for conducting independent negotiations on behalf of sovereign Russia. Members of the faction "Russia" believe that in the process of negotiations with the neighboring Baltic states Russia's interests should be represented directly and in full.

Deputies Pass Bills on Territorial Integrity

OW0211195291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1730 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Federation's Congress of People's Deputies has taken in principle a decision on safeguarding Russia's political stability and territorial integrity. After discussing today, Saturday, three draft documents to that effect the Congress has authorized the Supreme Soviet to unify them and issue a final ruling incorporating the proposals and amendments by the deputies.

One of the drafts prepared by the Nationalities House suggests a definition of integral and indivisible Russian Federation and all its subiects, also the main principles of dividing powers between the federal bodies and those of the federation's subjects to be set down in a federal treaty.

It urges speedy passage of laws protecting society from escalating ethnic conflicts, guaranteeing the rights of small nations and ethnic minorities, and also agreements with the former Union republics on protecting ethnic Russians living there.

The drafts demand measures protecting Russia's territorial integrity, national statehood and vital interests of various peoples populating it.

The draft prepared by the parliamentary group RUSSIA finds inadmissible any talks on handing over to Japan of four Southern Kuril Islands as detrimental to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] territorial integrity.

It urges the government of the republic to switch over as soon as possible to trade at world prices and in convertible currency, in view of some former Union republics introducing unilaterally their own customs controls, arbitrary prices, and national currencies, thus sapping Russia's resources.

Khasbulatov Delivers Closing Speech to Congress

LD0311233391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2222 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Speech by Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, at the closing session of the Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Deputies in Moscow on 2 November—recorded; from the "Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies" program]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies, fellow countrymen:

The extraordinary Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies, which resumed its activity after a prolonged interval which saw major social and political changes take place in the country's life, is concluding its work. The 18 months of experience in the intense activity of the deputy corps has, to a great degree, made it possible to hold our congress in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

The increased political maturity of people's deputies and the consolidation of factions and groups of deputies have contributed to the adoption of an important political decision. The president's appeal to the peoples of Russia and the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies, which contains program tenets aimed at extricating our economy and society from the deep economic and social crisis in which they find themselves, has become a major event in the congress' work. Having examined the president's appeal and discussed the republic's social and economic situation, the congress has approved the main principles of economic reform. One should say directly that the implementation of economic reform will become a serious test not only for the state's top institutions and legislative, executive, and judicial authorities, but for our statehood itself as well, for its present and future.

In this sense, the president's call for unity among all civic, truly patriotic, national, and political forces—which was approved by the congress—may create an important precondition for a way out of the crisis. Herein lies one of our important tasks: Russian-wide consolidation of efforts aimed at extricating the country out of the crisis, consistently implementing economic and political reforms, and turning the country into a worthy member of the international community. We are to integrate the interests of different social strata, Russia's regions, and political groupings within a short period of time in order to create a single pull of force [prityazheniye sily].

Russian-wide consolidation should become the main idea of the evolution in a new Russian Federation. The example of other countries, which have lived through similar experience, shows that we need national reconciliation today. The war between the reds and the whites has not yet been legally ended; it has never ended officially in our country. Of course, the call for unity does not apply to those who have breached the law,

infringed upon the development of democracy in the Russian Federation, and are crudely violating Russia's laws. The elected judges of the Constitutional Court must, right now, assist in establishing legality, strengthening law and order, and instilling in citizens respect for the basic law of the republic. The corps of deputies and the Russian Supreme Soviet will give all-around assistance to forming a judicial authority for the purpose of asserting the supremacy of law. We will work together on creating a dynamic balance between legislative, executive, and judicial authorities.

We deeply believe that, recognizing the great rights and lofty responsibility of the Russian president in forming the bodies of executive power and his outstanding personal prestige, both the Congress and the Supreme Soviet must actively assist the president in this process as equal partners. A modified system of executive power must be fully based on a legal foundation created and formed by the Russian parliament. We must help the Russian president to create bodies of power which will reliably implement the laws that we have adopted.

The congress has expanded the Russian president's plenary powers regarding the suspension of decisions by bodies of executive power which contradict RSFSR laws and the establishment of a procedure to legally support economic reform.

I would like to repeat that we must now distinguish between long-term tasks aimed at developing Russia and more short-term tasks, the tasks dealing directly with finding a way out of the crisis and stabilizing the situation. In our opinion, at the present moment it is worth taking special care in forming the bodies for the country's administration under crisis conditions. They must be formed very quickly without immediately dismantling the existing state apparatus.

Here, in the Russian Federation, we are already counting the days and hours. A simplified rehashing of the existing Russian state apparatus will lead to a paralysis and demoralization of state administration, which could mean the crash of the state in society's eyes before we can embark upon a new way of functioning. We must not repeat the center's mistakes, when the country's president lost valuable months transforming the Council of Ministers into the Cabinet of Ministers, the tragic results of which we are aware.

On the other hand, the establishment of effective bodies of state administration for the near future and the longer term should be taken on in parallel with the task of stabilizing the situation in Russia and the task of leading it out of the crisis. Naturally, the handling of these tasks should be closely interconnected.

In creating a capable system of state administration it is necessary for us to clearly realize that the political struggle for power and the creation of a new state are tasks which differ in many ways. They require different human qualities and different teams of people. In this connection we welcome the Russian president's statement on specialists and professionals in government work at various levels. No major reform in the world has been carried out without the participation of genuine specialists, without their optimal combination within the government, including the higher echelons, with democratically elected political figures.

The main criteria for cooperation of this sort should be the level of their professional knowledge, the abilities of their organizers, and their understanding of the necessity of deep reforms, but not adherence to this or that political platform. To set up capable bodies of state administration, we need to work on legislation which determines the rights and duties of civil servants who form the so-called civil service, on their social protection to the extent customary in all civilized states.

Otherwise the state apparatus will be unable to work normally and wage the battle against corruption which was discussed, with good reason, by the president of the Russian Federation and by people's deputies in their speeches at our congress. In our view, the Supreme Soviet must cooperate with the executive authorities in playing a prominent role in Russia's national security policy and its international political and foreign economic activities.

We are particularly alarmed by developments in our relations with the Ukraine. In our view, mistakes have already been made on both sides. They need to be corrected. Equality of rights and friendly relations, first and foremost, between the Ukraine and Russia are a guarantee of not only Russian national security but also international security as a whole. The Supreme Soviet must support all the president's efforts. The congress must support all the president's efforts to create such relations, displaying wisdom, farsightedness, and discipline in the activities of the whole corps of deputies. This program must be coordinated with similar actions in other republics. I call on all people's deputies of the Russian Federation to handle their statements on all these matters with the utmost sense of responsibility, particularly concerning the national security interests of the Russian Federation, and to ensure that their statements conform to existing legal norms and international political culture and ethics.

Our relations with the independent new states around Russia are now in their initial stage of development. What is being done today will serve as the foundation for our relations for decades ahead and beyond. We must all be mindful of that. All aspects of our relations with members of the former union must be based on rigid observance of the norms of international law. Naturally, that also applies to the issue of Russia's state succession.

Concern for the social protection of servicemen and their families must become one of the most important issues for the congress and the Supreme Soviet, particularly in the immediate future. I think the Supreme Soviet should

define, inter alia, a special Russian program of socioeconomic adjustment and support for former servicemen and their families.

Of course, people's deputies have to remember that people are utterly tired of our long-winded speeches. Even the finest and seemingly compelling and meaningful speeches are now more of an irritant to the population than a mobilizing factor. We need to change the correlation between word and action. That is an exceedingly urgent matter at this time.

Concluding the congress, we are aware of the difficulties which we all and our people are to overcome in order to halt the collapse of the economy, eliminate seats of tension, and stop the process of degradation of statehood itself. Permit me, on your behalf, to address the citizens of Russia with the assurance that the corps of deputies will take all possible measures to stabilize the economy and create worthy living conditions for all the peoples of the Russian Federation.

Permit me to thank all who helped to prepare for the congress. That includes the deputies who have worked actively in the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet and at the congress itself, the majority of staff in its apparatus, and its experts. The congress proceedings was backed up by hundreds of people at the Great Kremlin Palace. We also enjoyed the favorable attention of Soviet and foreign journalists, whom I would also like to thank. Thank you very much. [applause]

Further on Congress Conclusion

LD0211173391 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Ludmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—The second stage of the Fifth Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, which ended in the Kremlin today, did not resemble in any way the first stage, held last July.

The first stage turned into an endless and futile discussion over the election of the chairman of the Russian parliament. The second stage gave the permission to the Russian president to implement radical economic reform, the results of which will determine not only the political career of Russian leaders, but also the future of the whole country.

"In my opinion, the main result of the congress is that for the first time since we began our work the tasks facing the legislators were fulfilled," Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Russian parliament, told TASS. "At this congress we for the first time gave up political struggle (as much as we could) and got down to business."

After the Soviet and Russian Communist Parties actually left the political arena after the August putsch and the communists of Russia parliamentary group lost some of its influence, confrontation between the two almost equal parliamentary groups, which often brought russian congresses to a deadlock, disappeared. For the first time the congress did not exceed the time limit.

The congress elected chairman of the parliament (Ruslan Khasbulatov), his four assistants and the constitutional court. It also made some amendments to the Russian Constitution. The parliament was assigned to finish the draft fundamental law and submit it to the next congress.

However, it is the support by the congress for President Yeltsin's intention to begin radical economic reform that became the highlight of the congress. In his appeal to the peoples of Russia, made at the congress, he expressed readiness to head the government personally. Thus, Yeltsin, who has displayed admirable political courage on more than one occasion, actually staked his career as a politician.

Yeltsin's supporters approved this decision and the programme, sincerely hoping that it would be a success. His opponents also supported the programme, but probably for a different reason. They hope that no politician, even as popular as Yeltsin, will hold out through the forthcoming period.

The programme itself, as set forth by Yeltsin, gave grounds to some criticism at the congress both for its declarative character and for its key part—the planned liberalisation of prices. Nevertheless, the legislators granted Yeltsin without any serious objections almost all the additional prerogatives that he asked for, including the right to suspend federal legislative acts, if they hamper the implementation of the reform.

The congress laid the foundation of political and civil accord for the difficult period of the implementation of the reform, as the president requested. The main democratically-minded movements and parties announced the creation of a bloc for the political support of the reform. One of its missions will be to lessen social tension created by the reform. The Democratic Russia Movement suggested that reform support centres be created all over Russia, the main task of which will be to break down the resistance of local authorities to the reform.

Thus, the Fifth Russian Congress of People's Deputies marked the transition to the radical economic reform, which may decide the destiny of Russia. The next congress, scheduled for next March, will sum up its first results.

Federation Affairs

Future of USSR Foreign Ministry Discussed

OW0111133391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1145 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent was told at Russia's foreign ministry, today a conference opened there. It involves foreign ministers from sovereign republics or their envoys. Those present are discussing the future of the USSR foreign ministry. The heads of republican diplomacy will submit their suggestions to the USSR State Council which convenes for a session in Moscow on Monday [4 November].

Addressing the congress of Russian people's deputies on Monday [28 October], President Boris Yeltsin pointed to the need to reduce the staff of the USSR foreign ministry at least tenfold. Russian leaders believe that after its reorganization the central foreign ministry will become an interrepublican coordinating and advisory structure.

Foreign Minister Comments

LD0111170891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1531 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Nov (TASS)—"The issues of radically transforming the entire diplomatic service of the USSR Foreign Ministry, reducing the staff of the Union ministry, and converting it into a coordinating and consultative body have been greeted with understanding by the representatives of the sovereign republics," Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev stated in an interview for Soviet journalists. This was the theme of his meeting in Moscow today with the heads of the foreign policy departments and their representatives from the sovereign states. At the meeting, the USSR Foreign Ministry was represented by USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and Deputy Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko.

Andrey Kozyrev considers that reform should take place in such a way that all the potential which has been built up can be preserved. He has expressed himself in favor of the independence of the republics on foreign policy issues, but with the maximum possible coordination with each other. The minister said that for this we need a USSR Foreign Ministry which will not be too large in itself, but which will be a mobile coordinating system. Andrey Kozyrev considers that the quicker this reorganization takes place, the quicker those working for the Union ministry can start to work in their new places and the greater the chance of preserving some sort of coordinating structure. In his words, all the republics share these ideas.

In a conversation with a TASS correspondent, Vladimir Petrovskiy voiced his conviction that the reduction of the staff of the Union department will not affect knowledgeable, qualified specialists. The Soviet diplomat reported that at today's meeting many were proposing that the USSR Foreign Ministry structure should be 10 times smaller, but he added that no definitive resolution has been reached on this issue yet.

Vladimir Petrovskiy said: "There is no doubt that a highly professional diplomatic service needs to be preserved in the remaining structures, reflecting the interests of the new state formation on the territory of the former Union." In his own words, USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin supports the idea of the reorganization of the ministry's diplomatic service.

Further on Kozyrev Remarks

LD0311171591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Report by S. Frolov, including recorded interview with Russian Foreign Minister A.V. Kozyrev, from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] Most people working in this high-rise building on Smolesnk Square in Moscow are now in a state of shock. This is hardly surprising, given that the State Council has been presented with a Russian proposal for reorganizing the Union Foreign Ministry, involving cutting its staff to about one-tenth [as heard].

[Kozyrev] Yes, 80 or 90 percent of the Union Foreign Ministry staff are good professionals, people who are capable, who will—and I am sure they want to—know how to work at the real problems facing Russia, at the real problems facing other republics. It is essential to seize this chance, while we have it, of creating coordinating structures among the republics. This does not mean a cut-back in the Union Foreign Ministry; it is the creation of a new coordinating structure which might be called the USSR Foreign Ministry or whatever you like—it does not matter what it is called—but one which would be able to help the republics deal with these matters by performing coordinating or consultative functions, or whatever. The last thing is to insure continuity of the USSR's international obligations. It is very important that the republics should take these directly upon themselves and exercise them. Otherwise we would be in danger of losing a large number of positive things which have been achieved, especially in recent times.

More Reaction to, Support for Yeltsin Reforms

Editorial on Price Liberalization

PM0411102391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 91 p 1

["Editorial View" article by Ivan Sharov under the general heading: "PRAVDA Snap Poll": "Free Prices: Let Us Wait and See"]

[Text] The Russian president has announced resolute measures for the economy. We are talking first and foremost about prices, but here we have another of our life's paradoxes: The prospect of runaway prices caused a wave of horror, yet they are already rampaging out of control, trampling on people, and not so much biting as gnawing mercilessly.

Let us finally admit to ourselves that it was we and no one else who let them grow fangs. Prices are bound to grow in such well fertilized soil: factories and plants closing and discipline, labor productivity, and production—industrial and food—volumes in disastrous decline everywhere. For too long our hands have been idly applauding hoarse tribunes promising and demanding everything and anything. As long as the political sabers rattle and we heed their clashing monotone, as long as the tugging at the obviously shrinking "Union" blanket continues, as long as economic common sense remains dumb, we will be overwhelmed by the steamrolling, anarchic force of our bazaar or scrimmage of a market.

What to do? Both the wisest and those of moderate intelligence throw up their hands in dismay. True, there are some, radicals by habit, who are prepared to gamble with millions of human lives, cast them into the maelstrom of the market, and let them swim as they may, be they mermen with gills or heavy axes.

The combination of words "liberalization of prices" sounds like an insult. Liberty, then, for whom? There is also a type of liberty that cannot settle down, that serves no useful purpose, and that is eventually trampled. How many "free" people do we have like this, whose groans are already audible? Oh Lord, we cannot go on. How do we protect them? One of the slogans of the trade unions' fall offensive goes: market pay for market prices. Obviously, it is fair to add market productivity to that. Given the dearth of commodities, money today is like autumn leaves under foot. There have also been strike calls. Fine, I suppose, considering the human desperation, although no work means no income and no goods. I would just like to whisper to you the tired old phrase: We must work and forget about meetings and rallies, but people will interrupt and object: What about the working conditions? they will say. What is the use of this work? What nonsense—everyone is right, there is nobody to blame let alone to force to do things.

It is as clear as day that someone who finds life oppressive today, someone unable to bear the burden of the pirate market, someone who has been driven into a corner will not know the details of who is actually to blame. He has nothing to lose; he will go to any lengths. The smooth-tongued populists and the big noises with their underground past should expect this—everyone must think while his mind is still intact. It is necessary at least to distribute intelligently and painlessly what we get from abroad. I am already reading resigned forcasts that the needy will never see at least one-third of the foreign package—they will be stolen. Will all the night watchmen and guards be looking the other way? Let us smash the locks of the cozy storerooms and larders where mountains of stolen goods are already to be found. Let us stop using the soft touch regarding many commercial secrets because you do not hide things that are whiter than white. Whether or not there will be a famine I do not know, but I definitely do know that famine is no joke.

Volskiy, Medvedev Comment

LD0211144591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin's speech at the Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies has brought forth many reactions. They are still coming in to our service. Here are some reactions: Arkadiy Volskiy, deputy chairman of the Committee for the Operative Adminstration of the USSR's Economy, has expressed support for the Russian president. He noted that the program of market transformations proposed by him defends the idea of a market area and a single bank, tax, and tariff system. On the other hand, Roy Medvedev, one of the leaders of the just established RSFSR Socialist Party of Working People, said at a news conference in Moscow that the system of measures for getting out of the crisis proposed by the Russian president will not lead to improvement by next autumn. Answering an INTERFAX question, Medvedev called utopian the attempts by the Russian leadership to find a way out of the present political crisis by destroying the center. His party does not renounce the communist idea or communist view.

Liberal Party Chairman Reacts

LD0211145191 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Vinitskaya]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party of the USSR, Vladimir Zhirinovsky, today criticized the program Russian President Boris Yeltsin put forward on Monday [28 October] at the Fifth Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies. This year Zhirinovsky ran for Russian presidency, and rated third, and, in some Russian areas, second, among the six candidates.

He agreed in general with Yeltsin's forecast—"If the situation in Russia does not improve by fall, 1992, they will sweep us off"—but expressed confidence that it will happen much earlier.

He criticized the liberalization of prices and said that the majority of Russians "should get ready for doss-houses and a free ration of soup". Zhirinovsky believes Yeltsin should, at the same time, declare the creation of an immigration service since "indulgence in the formation of independent states on native Russian lands and across the country will lead to an increase in the number of refugees".

According to Zhirinovsky's forecast, by spring, 1992, the number of jobless, hungry and angry refugees will reach 20 to 40 millions.

The leader of the Liberal Democratic Party described Yeltsin's decision on the moratorium on nuclear tests as a mistake, and stressed that "the Russian nuclear shield ought not to be broken".

Zhirinovsky bluntly rejected accusations of his party of Russian nationalism and even "fascism". He reproached mass media, which, in his words, often distorts the political image and the course of the Liberal Democratic Party.

The Liberal Democratic Party is "on its way to power", said Vladimir Zhirinovsky.

Deputies on 'Social Explosions'

PM0411104391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Nov 91 p 2

[TASS report: "Deputies Warn"]

[Text] Moscow—People's Deputies Valentin Tsoy and Galina Starovoytova have expressed in interviews with TASS correspondents their concern over possible social explosions that might be caused by implementing the radical economic reforms proposed by Boris Yeltsin. In their opinion, the liberalization of prices should be accompanied by the preservation of stable prices for the needy.

Valentin Tsoy, chairman of the "Dalnevostochnyy Soyuz" [Far East Union] Consortium Founders' Council is worried by the threat of famine which is becoming increasingly apparent for the poor. After all, people's discontent, in his opinion, might spill in the direction of the new class of entrepreneurs to which he himself belongs.

Valentin Tsoy believes that the liberalization of prices will hit the low income earners hard—the elderly, the disabled, students, and families with many children. It is necessary to specify a group of products that can be sold to these people at stable prices.

Galina Starovoytova, USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputy, holds the same opinion. She names specific products—bread and milk—whose prices should remain low for the needy. Otherwise it will be impossible to avoid famine, the signs of which are becoming increasingly noticeable in St. Petersburg.

Russian Parties Back Yeltsin

LD0111173291 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—A number of Russia's political parties have consented to sign an agreement to back Russian President Boris Yeltsin's reform drive, according to Vasily Lipitskiy, board chairman of the People's Party of Free Russia (former Democratic Party of Communists of Russia).

He was speaking at a briefing during a recess at the meeting of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. The agreement, he said, will be signed by his party, the Republican Party of Russia, Social Democrats, Democratic Party of Russia, Farmers' Party of Russia, the People's Party, the Party of Constitutional Democrats and representatives of the Democratic Russia bloc.

According to Lipitskiy, these parties will provide staffers for the Cabinet of Ministers, the state structures and specialized agencies which will enact the reform policy.

While agreeing to support the reform concept set forth by the Russian president, he noted, these parties will propose their own mechanisms for its implementation.

In his address to the peoples of Russia at the opening of the congress on October 28, Yeltsin called on parties and public movements to form a political bloc in support of economic reforms.

'Political Bloc' Formed

LD0211203591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] At a meeting on 1 November between the leaders of Russia's main parties and public movements, the participants decided to set up a political bloc that will support Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic President Boris Yeltsin in implementing radical economic reform. Vladimir Lysenko, leader of the Republican Party of the Russian Federation, announced this today at a press conference in the Kremlin at the end of the Fifth Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

Also taking part in the news conference were Nikolay Travkin, leader of the Democratic Party of Russia; Oleg Rumyantsev, leader of the Social Democratic Party; and Vasiliy Lipitskiy, leader of the People's Party of Free Russia.

According to Vladimir Lysenko, a draft agreement between the political parties and the president was drawn up at the meeting. It was submitted to Boris Yeltsin today. "We believe that the parties should take a direct part in drawing up the reform and should have the opportunity to subject draft presidential and governmental decisions to preliminary expert analysis," he added.

A separate point in the draft agreement envisages that the political parties and movements should give "recommendations on personnel appointments to implement reform" and that the president is bound to take these recommendations into account.

Nikolay Travkin believes that what is involved here is the "creation of a mechanism to attain civil consent to a difficult period of reforms." This step, however, cannot in itself be regarded simply as the unconditional support of the parties for the president. The parties, in his view, should understand what the president is proposing and

should bring this to the people through party structures. "The main assistance from the parties is ideological backing for reforms throughout the country," he said.

Oleg Rumyantsev described helping to establish a multiparty system as one of the main goals of setting up the bloc of political parties and concluding an agreement with the president. Many members of the presidential apparatus are in his opinion seeking "to prevent political parties from having any influence on executive power." Vasiliy Lipitskiy thinks that the agreement between the parties and the president "could give society a mechanism for coordinating the interests of the masses," which will help to avert a social explosion.

Filshin 'Fully Supports' Yeltsin

LD0311135791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] Gennadiy Filshin, foreign economics minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, stated in an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent that he fully supports the main points of Yeltsin's program. At the same time he underlined that what is important now is not so much a strategy as the resolve to fulfill this program, and it is clearly felt that the president has the resolve to this.

The minister stressed that it is also important now for all political forces, irrespective of their tendencies, to support the program, or at least not to prevent its implementation. Without this it will be extremely difficult to implement any kind of reforms, especially such radical ones, Filshin pointed out.

Rutskoy, Others React

LD0311212191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] The economic program of Russian President Yeltsin and his intention to become head of the republic's Cabinet of Ministers were probably the biggest sensations of the week. Naturally, all this is still being studied and debated. Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Vice President Rutskoy believes that the current authorities are to blame for the current lamentable living conditions of the Russian people. We have been paying more attention to politics than to economics, he said. President Akayev of Kyrgyzstan considers that Yeltsin has presented a very strong program, which to a large degree ties in with what is being done in Kyrgyzstan. The only thing that upsets him is liberalization of prices given the total absence of goods. Khasbulatov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, expressed deputies' hope that in the near future the president will be able to sufficiently strengthen the government.

(Belozertsev), candidate of philosophical sciences, believes that Yeltsin is wrong in trying to head the government, and this move will lead to consolidation of right-wing forces. Lubenchenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, drew this conclusion: A very incisive, momentous, highly controversial and responsible deed has been done. Yeltsin acted like a fighter who keeps going to the end.

'Radical' Economic Reforms Viewed

LD0311233591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Nov 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] This week Russia's President Boris Yeltsin presented his program for radical economic reforms, which has put him at the focus of attention not just in our country but in the world. The president demanded extended powers in order to implement the program. Yeltsin's speech evoked various responses in the West: "the only sensible step," said Voice of America; "a step back from democracy," said BBC radio; "a risky venture," said Finnish radio. One way or another, Boris Yeltsin was man of the week last week.

[Correspondent M. Osokin] Russia's President Yeltsin is again the focus of attention. His reform program has been endorsed by the deputies of the Russian Congress, and the president has gained rights which in effect allow him to veto any decisions, including Union laws, if they hinder the reforms.

Many were surprised at how easily the congress approved all this. Newspapers started writing that reason and a considered approach had triumphed, but perhaps something else also played a role. Having given Yeltsin the rights he asked for, the deputies by the same token freed the parliament of responsibility should the reforms fail, and the dangers on this road are indeed great. The government will have to carry out such harsh and unpopular measures that some have started speaking of it as a suicidal government. In such circumstances, Yeltsin's resolve to be at the head of this course looks not only like a bold step but a truly heroic one.

Dangers lie in wait not just for the president; failure of the attempts to overcome economic difficulties could bring about a generally negative reaction from people toward the new authorities which are striving for reform, hence it looks as if the Russian leaders are paying particular attention to the efforts to unify various political forces around the new course. Yeltsin gave clearly to understand that he will put an end to the quarrels that have torn his administration. At the congress he called for a unified political bloc to be formed to support reforms. Evidently there will now be a rebuilding of his relations with the Democratic Russia movement, which clearly feels squeezed out of power.

Finally, the search for allies could provide fresh impetus for Yeltsin to cooperate with President Gorbachev as well, who could act as a mediator between various forces

and republics, and who is also a figure with whom politicans in the West have grown accustomed to dealing.

Much remains unclear in this matter, in the relations between the two presidents. Here exists a lack of definition in the demarcation of powers, very substantial differences of opinion, and simply the burden of old grudges, which is of no small importance in politics. It is not by chance that Yeltsin, speaking about the new alliance with Gorbachev, at the same time repeatedly emphasized that they have never been friends, and in one interview he expressed this through an image with which we are very familiar—that he and Gorbachev have never been drinking companions.

Economist on Yeltsin Plan

LD0411092391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0200 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Tex] Implementing Boris Yeltsin's economic reform program presented to the Russian parliament will lead to prices rising no less than 200 percent in the first few months, Professor Yegor Gaydar, the well known Soviet economist who, it is believed in London, will be responsible for implementing these reforms, said in an interview on BBC Television's "Money Program." The economist stated that the food subsidies will evidently be reduced significantly to save money for social measures. In Gaydar's view, Yeltsin will have to use all the additional powers that he received last week to influence the trade unions and prevent possible strikes.

Belorussia

Shushkevich Reacts to Yeltsin Reform Plan

LD0311145191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Remarks by S.S. Shushkevich, chairman of the Belarussian Supreme Soviet, date and place not given; From the "TV Inform" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The Russian reform program could not of course fail to affect the economic policies of the sovereign republics. Whether Russia has its own currency or not, and the liberalization of prices—these will of course also reflect directly or indirectly on those policies.

[Shushkevich] In general terms, I don't see any catastrophe. I have studied Yeltsin's speech very carefully, and I see it simply as an acceleration, a resolute acceleration, of Russia's progress in the direction of a market economy. I think it's good and perhaps we should also think about an acceleration.

The most worrying point is the introduction of their own currency. The economic agreement permits the introduction of one's own currency, but there have to be definite principles of regulating emission. Quite honestly, we haven't yet had any such resolute intentions of introducing our own Belorussian currency, but we clearly now have to think about this issue, because if such actions gain in pace in Russia, then we have to act in a manner that is commensurate to the situation.

Republic Faces Economic 'Aggression' From East

LD0211225991 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 0750 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The situation today is for some reason reminiscent of June 1941. Then Germany attacked Belorussia with weapons, whereas now the aggression is coming from the East and is of an economic character. We were not ready then and we are not ready now.

Meanwhile Boris Yeltsin rather transparently hinted earlier: Russia will follow the way of radical reforms. There is no point in quoting him, the main points are essentially known to everyone. It is more interesting to see how the Belorussian parliamentarians reacted to the Russian bombshell. Sergey Shevtsov writes about it in his article "Russian Bombshell in the Belorussian Parliament," published in ZVYAZDA.

Official Rejects Failed Coup Support Reports

LD0211062591 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By BYELTA correspondent Yevgeniy Gorelik]

[Text] Minsk November 2 TASS—We do not possess any documentary support to the idea that a possibility of using nuclear weapons against army units opposing the Moscow coup organisers' decisions could exist, said Igor Pyrk, chief of Belorussian parliament provisional committee investigating state political structures' activities during the failed coup. All we possess is a well-known order by Marshal Yazov to bring all the units in the Belorussian zone ready for action. Those who spread rumours referring to my statements act indecently, to say the least.

At the very beginning of the investigation the committee made a statement we shall abstain from comment and there was no exception to that not even for the POST-FAKTUM agency.

Neither do I possess any evidence to the plans of seizing the TV center, Pyrk said.

I come to a conclusion we shouldn't invite journalists to our sittings as they frequently resort to slander in search of hot items, he added.

Cooperation Agreement Signed With Moldova

LD0211184991 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 0400 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] A permanent representative office of the Republic of Moldova in the Republic of Belorussia was ceremonially opened yesterday in the picturesque suburb of Minsk. Premier Muravskiy, while cutting the red ribbon, stressed: The exchange of permanent representative offices is only the first step in our contacts. I think that there will be a second one: the opening of embassies of the two sovereign states.

The ceremony of signing the agreement between the governments of the Republics of Moldova and Belorussia on the principles of trade and economic cooperation lasted less than an hour. It is the result of the qualitative work of experts from both sides. The document notes that the regulation of supplies of the most important types of goods will be carried out at the governmental level. The sides are obliged to prepare a respective supplement to the agreement by 25 November.

Vyacheslav Kebich drew the attention of those present to the fact that the document includes possible sanctions against each other in the event of nonfulfillment of mutual obligations.

On the same day the guests visited the Katyn memorial complex and the workshops of the Belorussian motor vehicle works in Zhodino. The delegation left for [word indistinct] in the evening.

Moldova

Yeltsin Speech Assailed, Countermeasures Vowed

LD0111195591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] Konstantin Tampiza, Moldova's minister of national economy, has stated that some of the points put

forward in the speech by Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], cause perplexity and concern, to put it mildly, to say nothing of their somewhat threatening nature for sovereign and independent states, former subjects of the USSR. The categorical nature of his speech can worsen relations between the sovereign states and Russia in economic aspects. Moldova, Tampiza stressed, will respond to the Russian Government by taking countermeasures. Everything we supply to the USSR also will be based on world prices. There are other levers as well. Thousands and thousands of Moldova's citizens work in a number of Russian regions. Russia will have to pay world prices for their labor, and naturally, in hard currency. Transit routes through Moldova, a Balkans gas-pipe and the supply of electricity to this region of the world, etc.,—all these facilities will be used by us, the minister said.

'Militants' Demand Reunification With Romania

AU0311184191 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 1800 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] Some 10,000 militants of the Moldovan People's Front today gathered in the center of Chisinau [Kishinev] demanding the reunification of the Republic of Moldova with Romania.

According to an AFP report, the march took place in a calm atmosphere with the demonstrators demanding, among other things, the replacement of the ruble with the leu, as well as the establishment of borders with the Ukraine, and the dismantlement of border checkpoints with Romania.

Snegur Resignation Demanded

AU0311174191 Paris AFP in English 1727 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Text] Chisinau, [Kishinev] Soviet Union, Nov 3 (AFP) —Some 10,000 demonstrators rallied amid tight security Sunday [3 November] in Moldova's capital Chisinau to back calls for the republic to be made part of Romania.

The demonstrators, members of the Moldovan People's Front, demanded Moldovan President Mircea Snegur resign and chanted "Down with the economic community treaty." They were referring to the proposed treaty defining economic relations between the Soviet republics, which the Moldovan Government plans to sign.

Protesters also called for the ruble to be replaced in Moldova by the leu, Romania's currency.

Army, Border Guards To Be Reorganized

AU0211153891 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0938 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 2/11/1991—The Supreme Security Council of the Republic of Moldova convened in Chisinau [Kishinev] to examine the new organisational patterns of the Armed Forces, Interior Ministry units and frontier guards, announces a release of the President's Press Office, relayed by MOLDOVA PRES.

Considering the course of developments in the former Soviet Union and concrete facts, the Council decreed: An immediate partial recruitment of the youths in the Republic to complete security and frontier corps; an urgent decision, by presidential decree, on the future of the armament extant on the territory of Moldova; the opening of schools for the drilling of recruits and for refresher courses to reserve officers. The necessity was pointed out of speeding up the adoption of the adequate legislation.

The Council agreed to appoint an official commission of the Republic for negotiations on military matters with the still acting central authorities, as well as with now independent states, formerly components of the Soviet Union.

The sitting was chaired by Moldova's President Mircea Snegur.

Deputy Favors Signing Economic Treaty

LD0211213991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 31 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast presented by Linnik]

[Text] The Moldovan parliament adopted the correct resolution in sending a delegation of its observers to participate in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, (Valentin Kunyev), a member of the delegation and a people's deputy from Moldova has told the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY. He does not rule out the possibility that the Moldovan delegation could at some time in the future change its observer status. Speaking as an economist, (Valentin Kunyev) expressed himself in favor of Moldova signing the Economic Treaty of sovereign states. Failure to do so might mean that the standard of living in the republic could continue to fall, which could lead to a substantial explosion.

Press Details Pre-Election Tension

AU3110171991 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1223 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 31/10/1991—The political life in the Republic of Moldova, already complicated, is particularly tense now, before presidential elections, assesses in a commentary [as received] "ROMANUL" weekly which comes out in Bucharest. The Bucharest newspapers note the "concern," "political deadlock," and more particularly the "political game" played in Bessarabia at a highly important moment in the history of the Romanians in general.

In the electoral race for the presidency—entered so far by three candidates: President Mircea Snegur, Grigori

Eremei, former first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party, and writer Gheorghe Malarciuc—the pro- and anti-union idea acquires ever higher importance.

Most of the criteria and strategic lines of cooperation between the Romanian administrations on the two banks of the Prut—reads the article headlined "Alleged Bessarabian Sovereignty and Dissidence" in "ROMANIA LIBERA" of October 30, have been amended by President Snegur's political conduct, more conciliatory than Moscow's "community" tendencies and obviously moderate in comparison with the open manifestations of the pan-Romanians and the integrationist shows of the "Druc wing." In this context the same daily notes "an incredible political background in its perfidy" materialized in the discrepancy between the great national symbols won over the past two years (the tricolour, the language, the alphabet, the sovereignty) and the stands taken by part of the politicians.

The proclamation of independence this summer, writes the same paper referring to the decision of the Great National Assembly in Chisinau [Kishinev], seemed a defiance to Moscow, but did not mean a defiance to the arbitrary Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact which artificially and abusively mutilated a country and the centuries-old integrity of a nation. Thus in the paper's opinion that deed is like a "show" which subsequently allowed other factionist forces (the Dnestrians and the Gagauz) to act similarly and issue unilateral declarations of independence proving republican zeal.

In an interview with "ROMANIA LIBERA" former Premier Mircea Druc considers presidential elections as "useless since they institutionalize presidency and creates a state under the name of republic, actually acknowledging the consequences of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact." Mr. Druc justifies his opposition to the "Snegur line" by not accepting the Kremlin's variant according to which "in 1940 Moldova was liberated from Romanian occupation." Likewise, the former premier does not consider realistic the comparison between the "file" of Bessarabia and Bukovina and those of the Baltic countries "their historic and political situations being basically different." "The only real elections that should be called in the region is that of joining the mother country," Mircea Druc says.

"ROMANIA LIBERA" asserts that "President Snegur's latest stands prove a 180 degree change and in a certain respect—the resumption of the anti-Romanian historical theses—of even 360 degrees" referring to the peremptory assessment that two related peoples who have common roots live on the two banks of the Prut (an old idea of the Soviet propaganda) in flagrant contradiction with his statement "let us stick together with our kin" which electrified Romania's Parliament this spring.

Snegur's wish to get a new mandate is blamed for these changes in stands but also "the most incredible pressure" put "directly and indirectly, through multiple levers" by Moscow as well as by Russian speakers and philo-Russians who practise a genuine blackmail, threat with secession, stage destabilizing actions. For their peace, president en titre Mr. Snegur managed to pass in the parliament an electoral law that bars from the competition the persons aged more than 60 (A. Mosanu, a historian, president of the parliament and one of the veterans of the People's Front), as well as those who did not have permanent residence in Bessarabia in the last ten years (a provision touching also his most dangerous opponent, former Prime Minister Mircea Druc). This law pleases that part of the electorate that long after the big empire and are afraid of a possible fast union with Romania.

The parliamentarians who "easily and irresponsibly" accepted "that act with a strong anti-Romanian orientation" (ROMANIA LIBERA), include the Russian-speakers who were not present at the sitting in which the independence was proclaimed and now do everything possible to keep Bessarabia away from Romania, the club of communists joined in by deputies from the club of agrarians, all of them making up an "obedient majority."

The only force that has steadily stuck to national positions is the People's Front, the party that has led the struggle for independence these last few years. In the absence of a candidate of equal appeal, the only choices were either reconciliation with the president or boycotting the elections. The latter solution was opted for, but, as assesses Romanian foreign affairs weekly LUMEA, that is a "two edged weapon," as the Russian-speakers too, are likely to boycott. This, the weekly writes, "will make the elections more likely to fail, but will allow for the propaganda hostile to the Front to present it as an ally of the separatists and for the president to capitalize on his centre-minded position."

In a statement of October 13 of the People's Front of Moldova, that declared firm opposition, to President Snegur, the head of state was accused of "evolution... toward a neo-communist dictatorship," "arbitrary policy", "intolerance" and the like.

It is interesting to note that the presidential elections takes place while, with all its proclaimed independence, the Republic of Moldova does not have some fundamental institutions of its own (a National Army, frontier guards, national currency), nor has it a constitution. However, the former Prime Minister M. Druc's firm unionist ideal is embarrassing in Chisinau for now and, while President Snegur sticks to his presidential-populist ambitions, as well as to the ambitions of "observer" to the newly set-up "common market" of the Soviet republics that one way or another opted for the Union treaty, people of the tenure and beliefs of M. Druc keep fighting and hoping on the barricades of the opposition, making some special unionist dissidence of Bessarabia.

Weekly LUMEA opines that both the Front and the president "are gambling their political future" in the

forthcoming elections. In the current circumstances, the LUMEA mentions, "when the republic faces numerous problems, and Romania is unable to help it as it should, it could, at least for a while, do without political conflicts." For, weekly ROMANUL writes, "it is not unlikely that the discord should facilitate the emergence of some Smirnov, Faraman, Popov, i. e. the falling apart of the whole national architecture that has started being remade these last few years."

Ukraine

Inter-Republic Economic Agreement To Be Signed

OW0211213991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1730 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Leonid Kravchuk has said at a meeting of editors of local newspapers that on Nov 4 or 5 the Ukraine will join the Economic Agreement signed by the republics of the former USSR. However, he doubted the agreement should prove viable since facts of the sides breaking their commitments have been known to occur.

Economic Links With USSR Stressed

LD0311180491 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] The Ukraine's Ministry of Economy is authorized to bring to the attention of leaders of industrial associations, enterprises, and organizations of the republic the fact that a joint decision on resuming further work to conclude economic agreements for 1992 between the economic subjects of the Ukraine and the Russian Federation was made at the meeting of the ministry leaders with representatives of the Russian Federation's government on 29 October, 1991. In this connection the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation has informed the councils of ministers of republics which are part of the RSFSR and the chairmen of kray and oblast executive committees that according to the Russian Federation president's decrees on economic ties and delivery of produce and goods in 1992 and Resolution N. 558 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers of 23 October, 1991, it is suggested that the telegram of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers of 22 July, 1991 on a temporary halt in concluding agreements with enterprises of other republics should be considered no longer valid.

The Governments of the Ukraine and the Russian Federation address leaders of industrial associations, enterprises, and organizations of the two sovereign republics and their work collectives with the request to take the necessary measures to preserve the established economic contacts which have existed for a long time and turn to concluding agreements for 1992 on delivery of products of technical industrial purpose, goods for popular consumption and foodstuffs, and to finish this work by no later than 1 December 1991. The traditionally strong economic, scientific, and technical and cultural contacts formed between the Ukrainian and Russian people have formed over many years. Breaking these stable contacts which have been existing for a long time can lead to considerable and irretrievable losses for the economy of both sovereign states.

Statement on Resolving Questions With Russia

LD0311091291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1852 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Aleksey Petrunya and TASS correspondent Aleksey Trotsenko]

[Text] Kiev, 30 Oct—The government delegations of Ukraine and Russia, headed by the republic's Foreign Ministers Anatoliy Zlenko and Andrey Kozyrev have announced a community of approaches toward resolving major issues of home and foreign policy. Today they held a detailed exchange of views in Kiev regarding the development of Ukrainian-Russian relations within the context of fulfilling the treaty and communique signed by the two republics.

During the negotations the common intention was expressed to pursue a strategic course toward strengthening traditional goodneighborly relations in all spheres of cooperation on the basis of complete equality and respect for sovereignty.

At the negotations, in which Ukraine Defense Minister Konstantin Morozov and Konstantin Kobets, chairman of the RSFSR Committee for Defense, took part, special attention was devoted to questions of nuclear weapons and of conventional armaments on the territories of the Ukraine and Russia. Ways of jointly coordinated operations in this sphere were discussed. The Russian delegation welcomed the statement of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet "about Ukraine's nonnuclear status."

The sides reaffirmed their readiness to observe the clauses of the 1991 Treaty on Limiting and Reducing Strategic Offensive Armaments and the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe in the part concerning armaments situated on their territories. Ukraine and Russia will, jointly with the other republic concerns, undertake the necessary steps for these documents to come into force as soon as possible. The sides welcomed measures for cutting and destroying tactical nuclear weapons.

The delegations stressed the community of approaches toward participation in international economic, currency, and financial institutions. Both republics intend to expand cooperation with the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and other organzations, and in the long-term to try to achieve membership.

Kiev Rejects Russian Claims to Supremacy

LD0211193691 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2000 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] If Ukraine does not join the economic community and later the political union, Russia may become the legal successor of the Soviet Union, Russia's President Boris Yeltsin said at the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies. In my view, one can see supremacy and superpower type of thinking of the present leaders of Russia in relation to sovereign states of the former Union. Oles Bedzyk, Radio Kiev observer, reports:

[Bedzyk] Well, this tendency has recently become typical of statements by political leaders both of the center and, unfortunately, Russia and in the mass media. This particularly showed itself in the situation around the territorial issue and about the legal succession to all nuclear forces of the Union and regarding the money.

In case it is necessary, they say, Russia will find ways to institute its control over the emission of rubles. [words indistinct] to show that Ukraine will not survive without the Union. It is discussed, particularly, in one of the latest issues of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, the newspaper with the biggest print run in the (?world) which is published in Moscow. According to the statistics adduced in the newspaper, Ukraine gives 16 percent of industry products and 22.5 percent of agricultural ones. The corresponding indices for Russia are more than 66 percent and 46 percent. The newspaper suggests a conclusion that Ukraine will collapse alone without any help.

Excuse my irony but such mercy brings tears to my eyes. How can you not listen to the elder brother? However here are different statistics: Volodymyr Pylypchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian parliament's Standing Commission for Issues of Economic Reform and Management of the National Economy, stressed that the statistics in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY newspaper were faked and garbled facts. According to the latest information of the Deutsche Bank, 46 percent and not 22.5 percent of all agrarian produce of the Union is produced in Ukraine and 26 percent—not 16 percent of industry products. Labor productivity in agriculture in Ukraine is at least twice as high as that beyond its borders.

And the last conclusion: If Ukraine were the Sahara, for example, it is unlikely it would be dragged into the Union.

Russian Cooperation Talks Conclude in Kiev

LD0211182691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2100 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Talks ended in Kiev today between the delegations of Russia and the Ukraine. The foreign and defense ministers and also deputy finance ministers took part.

The talks were devoted to the formation of new strategic relations between the two republics. A protocol was signed on cooperation and coordinating actions between the foreign ministries. The sides will resolve all disputed questions on the basis of consensus. The protocol states that the republics do not have territorial claims against each other.

The defense ministers, Konstantin Kobets and Konstantin Morozov, confirmed that each republic has the right to its own Armed Forces. Both sides are in favor of the Union's nuclear potential being centrally controlled although with republican representation. It was recognized as appropriate to destroy nuclear missiles in the Ukraine and not to transfer them to other regions.

Defense Minister Stresses Nuclear-Free Republic

LD0311162391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Nov 91

[From the Vesti newscast]

[Excerpt] The second congress of the Union of Officers of the Ukraine has opened in Kiev. Over 700 delegates from military okrugs stationed in the Ukraine as well as the western group of forces, the Black Sea Fleet, and the Baltic Sea Fleet stood to receive the blessings of the priest of the Ukrainian autocephalous orthodox church and sang "Our father" and "God save our Ukraine".

Colonel-General Morozov, Ukrainan minister of defense, spoke at the congress. He stressed once again the intention of the Ukraine to remain nuclear-free and described the utterances on the nuclear agressiveness of the republic as absurd provocations. The main danger for the Ukraine, according to General Morozov, lies in the growth of military might in the contiguous states and in bringing foreign troops to their territory. Morozov is concerned about the uncoordinated deployment of troops to areas outside the republic and he will work to hinder this. [passage omitted] [video shows officers in the congress hall, speakers]

Reaction to Republic Nuclear Claims Noted

924P0010A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[V. Mikheyev roundup: "The West Prefers To See the Ukraine Neutral and Nuclear-Free"]

[Text] **The decision adopted on Tuesday by the Ukrainian parliament to place under its jurisdiction the USSR Armed Forces on its territory evoked an abundance of contradictory and, understandably, initially anxious comment in political circles of the West. Their predictions that the trend toward the disintegration of the Soviet Union would assume an irreversible nature and that among the trickiest problems of the peaceful severance of relations would be the fate of the single Union Army, Air Force and Navy, but particularly, the nuclear potential, have come to pass.**

There was a response first and foremost from our main Western partners, with whom we have been conducting long and arduous negotiations on a reduction in Armed Forces and arms. Their reaction came forthwith—concern that an enlargement, even temporary, of the membership of the "nuclear club" would introduce uncertainty to the political dialogue in Europe and in relations with the North American superpower.

REUTERS quotes a statement from Richard Boucher, official spokesman of the U.S. State Department: "The plans to create a large-scale Ukrainian Army are contrary, it would seem, to the efforts of all countries of Europe and North America to reduce their Armed Forces and strengthen stability." He went on to observe: The United States "does not believe that the creation of large-scale independent Armies would correspond to constructive goals and is concerned at the economic effect which maintaining an Army of such proportions would have."

In turn, TASS transmits, David Howell, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the British Parliament's House of Commons, called this step "a serious threat to peace." In an interview with BBC radio he emphasized: "This is an example of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the appearance of new nuclear powers."

There is no overlooking the directly opposite viewpoint of Caspar Weinberger, former U.S. secretary of defense, who prefers that the nuclear weapons pass to the control of the republics to the continuation of "uncertain control" over them on the part of a weakening central leadership. This would accelerate, in his opinion, the conclusion of an agreement on an extensive and verifiable reduction in nuclear weapons. The former secretary declared: "It seems to me that the threat of war, the threat of the use of nuclear weapons all the more, would diminish considerably were the nuclear weapons to be in the hands of small regional groups, which are seeking their real independence and do not want war."

Today's responses contain more composed notes—a reason was the statement of Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko to the effect that the Ukraine was intent on being a nuclear-free power. The independent state wishes here to participate on an equal basis in international negotiations on a reduction in and the destruction of nuclear arsenals. In accordance with the agreements between the USSR and the United States, 130 of the 176 strategic nuclear warheads will be eliminated on the territory of the Ukraine. A. Zlenko, REUTERS points out, did not adduce numerical information on the tactical nuclear weapons deployed in the Ukraine.

Confirmation of this fundamental position came from two further sources. Vladimir Grinev, deputy head of the Ukrainian parliament, gave the assurance that "the Ukraine will not have its own nuclear arms.... We will put ourselves under the joint command of the strategic forces. Nuclear weapons will not be nationalized." The publication in a number of organs of the press concerning the fact that the Ukraine was hatching plans to become the owner of a strategic nuclear arsenal were refuted by Pavel Mysnik, chairman of a subcommission of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Standing Commission for Defense and State Security.

A well-disposed response on the part of the West was soon forthcoming. "We welcome the Ukrainian parliament's renunciation of nuclear arms and its resolve to make the Ukraine free of nuclear weapons," a statement of the U.S. State Department says. The British Foreign Office announced that the British Government hoped that an independent Ukraine would take specific steps to accomplish the set task—the creation on its territory of a nuclear-free zone.

The West is expressing the hope that the Ukraine will abide by the commitments assumed in the past by the USSR in respect to international agreements and will also adhere to its own legislation. An important reminder in the statement of the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry in this connection was the reference to the Declaration on State Sovereignty, which stresses the republic's intention to be in the future a neutral state and adhere to the three nonnuclear principles: not to accept, not to manufacture, and not to acquire nuclear weapons.

Kravchuk Seeks Unified Strategic Forces Plus Army

PM0311132691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Nov 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by Colonel A. Polyakov from Kiev: "Leonid Kravchuk: Military-Strategic Forces Should Be Unified"]

[Text] Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk met with officers of the Kiev Garrison in the course of the election campaign for the post of republic president.

The Ukraine, he said, is in favor of an economic community in which the will of each member would be respected. Seven republics have signed an agreement which states that none of them will act to the detriment of the others. Yet in Russia they are proposing to "release" prices without consulting with the other republics. Such actions put many others, including the Ukraine, in a difficult position.

On the question of the development of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the Ukraine, he reaffirmed his position: The military-strategic forces of the former Union should remain unified, controlled by the Defense Ministry and the General Staff. They could comprise 700,000-800,000 men in the Ukraine. That includes the Strategic Missile Forces and part of the Navy and Air Force. In addition, in approximately three years' time the Ukraine proposes to have its own Army of 200,000-250,000 men, which would include subunits of the republic guard, border forces, and internal forces.

Kravchuk stressed that he sees it as his main task to ensure peace and tranquility in the Ukraine. Under no circumstances, he said, will I sit at a table with anyone whatsoever to discuss revising borders. He announced that the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted a decision to ensure bilingualism in regions, oblasts, and even individual rayons where Russians or citizens of another nationality predominate. It has also been decided that in the 1 December referendum and presidential elections servicemen on compulsory service of any nationality, wherever they were drafted from, will be given the opportunity to vote.

Findings on 11 Oct Chernobyl Fire Noted

LD0211104591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] The government commission has found out what caused the breakdown on the second reactor at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant on the 11th of last month. A high-voltage switch, located hundreds of meters away from the engine room, turned on by itself. And this was caused by a damaged insulation in the cable line connecting the generator with the distributing devices. So a fire broke out, which was quickly put out.

Fire Breaks Out at Chernobyl Power Plant 1 Nov

LD0111172191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By Ukrinform correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev, 1 Nov (TASS)— At 1329 today in the machine hall of the No. 1 power unit of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, which is undergoing planned repairs, a cable caught fire for reasons as yet unknown in the cable compartment which houses cables carrying power to the auxiliary equipment of the No.1 generator and the machine hall.

As the UKRINFORM correspondent was informed at the plant, the fire was extinguished by the standard fire extinguishing system and by the efforts of the Chernobyl power plant's fire-fighting squad. The limits and conditions for safe operation of the reactor were not violated.

Since 18 October, the No.1 reactor has been cooled and has been undergoing planned repairs. The radiation situation at the station and around it remains unchanged.

Seven Candidates Registered for President

LD0311091191 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2300 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] The Central Electoral Commission for Elections of Ukrainian President held a meeting today in Kiev. It summed up the registration of proposed candidates for president. Only seven were able to become candidates out of 95 willing to take the president's chair. These are: Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk; Vyacheslav Chornovil, Levko Lukyanenko, Ihor Yukhnovskyy, Leopold Taburyanskyy, Volodymyr Hrynyov, people's deputies of the republic; and Agriculture Minister Oleksandr Tkachenko.

Candidate Backs Unified Strategic Forces Command

OW0111171891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1524 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Thursday [31 October] Leonid Kravchuk, who is running for Ukrainian presidency and is currently Ukrainian parliamentary leader, met with representatives of military units in the Kiev Military District

Kravchuk spoke in favour of unified military strategic forces under common command on the entire territory of the former Soviet Union.

Afghan Veterans Assail 'Political Games'

LD0311160691 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2300 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] The Union of Soldiers-Internationalists made an appeal to deputies and their colleagues in the Crimea today. The appeal notes, and I quote: Using a sharp fall in the people's standard of living and their dissatisfaction, the interested forces aspire to satisfy their own political goals and ambitions. What especially worries us is that Afghan veterans are being drawn into these dirty political games. They are absolutely shamelessly considered to be ruinous energy," [as heard].

The Union of Soldiers-Internationalists called on the Crimeans to prevent an increase of social tension and confrontation.

Azerbaijan

Continued Violence Reported in Nagorno-Karabakh

Armenians Attack Villages

LD0111144891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Text] We have just received this report from Islam Kuliyev, our correspondent in Azerbaijan.

Armenian armed formations have unleashed a large-scale operation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] aimed at evicting the Azerbaijani population from the oblast. The villages of Tugo and Khodzhavend have been completely ravaged and burned down. Other villages with an Azerbaijani population are being subjected to intensive fire from all sorts of weapons. Thousands of families have been evicted from their houses.

Elmira Kafarova, chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet, said at a morning session that Azerbaijan's People's Deputy Eldar Bagirov died yesterday in the Agdamskiy Rayon in tragic circumstances. He had left for the region two days ago.

Participants of the session demanded an urgent report from Ikhmet Gaibov, the republic's procurator general. It will be delivered in the second half of the day after the circumstances of the deputies' death have been clarified. The session continues its work.

Highlights of Recent Incidents Cited

NC0211200791 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent Anahit Tadevosyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 1 Nov (ARMENPRES)—GOLOS ARMENII reports that an independently-operated police force is to be formed in Nagorno-Karabakh soon. The Nagorno-Karabakh Republic's Soviet Executive Committee has instructed the local soviets and relevant services to study the idea until 15 November.

On 30 October, an airplane from Yerevan was forced to return to Yerevan after being fired on by OMON [Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment] troops when it attempted to land. One passenger was injured. The military helicopter which came to the plane's assistance was also fired upon. Six OMON members died in the ensuing firefight.

YERKIR reports that at 0300 on 30 October the Azerbaijanis fired rockets at the village of Khramort in Askeranskiy Rayon resulting in six homes being damaged. There were no casualties. Two houses were destroyed in the village of Karadagly in Martuninskiy Rayon. The freedom fighters fired on this village with machine guns and automatic weapons. There are no reports about the Azerbaijani side's losses.

Automatic Weapon Fire Noted

NC0211194591 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent Aleksandr Grigoryan]

[Text] Stepanakert, 31 Oct (ARMENPRES)—A number of mischievous crimes committed in the last few days have sharply exacerbated the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Reports indicate that the Armenian town of Khramort came under rocket fire from the direction of Agdam on the night of 31 October. Eight houses were destroyed. On the same night, individuals set fire to scores of homes in the Azerbaijani sector of Tog village in Gadrutskiy Rayon.

The law enforcement agencies of the state of emergency region and staffers at the military commandant's office have gone to the location of the incidents. There have been no reports on casualties.

The city of Martuni came under automatic weapon fire from the direction of Azerbaijani Khochavend village at 1120 on Wednesday, 30 October, injuring one Toksin Grigoryan. At 1630 a fire fight ensued in the same locality between the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's troop units stationed in Martuninskiy Rayon and the Azerbaijani militia, apparently members of the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment. Internal trooper Mikhail Napadin was injured. According to preliminary reports, six Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia members were killed the fight.

The military commandant of the state of emergency region has opened an investigation into the incident.

Stepanakert Mayor Resigns

NC0211201791 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Yerevan, 31 Oct (ARMENPRES)—GOLOS ARMENII and YERKIR papers report the following incidents in Nagorno-Karabakh:

An armed group infiltrated the area near Seydishen in Askeranskiy Rayon at 0900 on 28 October and fired on a "Kamaz" vehicle, killing 22-year old passenger Avedisyan.

At 1630 on the same day, an exchange took place in Martuninskiy Rayon. Armenian Grant Babyan was killed and Rudik Grigoryan was injured. Seyran Atayan, 20, was gravely injured at Krkzhan on 29 October, dying later following a five-hour operation. On the same day, an Azerbaijani plane on a flight from Yevlakh to Khodzhali lost control and crashed into a mountain near

Khnabad. The plane then caught fire and all the passengers and crew burned to death.

The mayor [chairman of the city soviet executive committee] of Stepanakert, Maksim Mirzoyan, resigned on 30 October.

The tension is acute near the Armenian villages of Berdavan and Barekamavan and the nearby Azerbaijani village of Shkhlu. Three Armenians have been taken hostage here and their fate is still unknown. A vehicle carrying rocks was fired on, killing two passengers. On 29 October, the haystacks in Verin Askebar were set on fire. Azerbaijanis themselves set their own animal fodder on fire in order to exacerbate the situation.

Moscow TV Details Republic Developments

LD0311214291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Nov 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] The situation on the Azerbaijan-Turkish border has been uneasy of late. A total of 10,000 Azeris entered Turkish territory via the new bridge across the Araks in the (Sadaran) area and refused to come back. This took place after the opening of direct transport communications between Azerbaijan and Turkey for the first time in 70 years. According to information provided by the Azerbaijan mission in Moscow, these events were not politically motivated, and many of those who crossed the border have already returned.

Yet another center of tension has appeared in Azerbaijan. Residents of the autonomous oblast of Nakhichevan cross the border with Iran in order to reach their native Azerbaijan, avoiding Armenian territory. A report from Baku informs on details of a sitting of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, which discussed the republic's military concept behind closed doors. It instructed Valeg Barshatly, minister of defense, to complete the formation of the national self-defense units within a three-month period.

Defense Council Discusses Forming Armed Forces

OW0211201091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1730 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Azerbaijan's Defence Council met in Baku Nov 1 chaired by Presient Ayaz Mutalibov. As the local papers report Saturday, the meeting discussed forming armed forces in the republic and measures against armed bands acting in Nagorno-Karabakh, in the Geranoboy district of Azerbaijan, and in the borderline areas between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Another point of the agenda was the republic's defence conception. The main goal for the national armed forces is seen in protecting the republic's sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence. The Finance Ministry informed the meeting on setting up a special extra-budgetary fund of self-defence.

Nakhichevan Leader Criticizes Economic Blockade

LD0211104291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Geydar Aliyev, chairman of the Supreme Majlis of the Nakhichevan Republic, has accused the leadership of Azerbaijan of economic blockade. Specifically, Aliyev says that about 100 trucks carrying humanitarian aid for Nakhichevan are waiting in Turkey, and that only bureaucratic red tape, he says, prevents the convoy from crossing the border. Baku's current policy regarding Nakhichevan, Aliyev declared, pursues the aim of aggravating the democratic processes leading toward autonomy.

Georgia

'Critical Point' Reached in South Ossetia

LD0311133991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0903 GMT 3 Nov 91

[By correspondent Valeriy Shahayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 3 Nov (TASS)—The situation at crisis spots in South Ossetia has reached a critical point. With darkness, the militants are bringing down on anti-aircraft fire on Tskhinvali, the rayon center Znauri, and neighboring villages, utilizing new long-range missiles and "Alazani" hail-fighting systems. The northern and southern outskirts of the rayon center suffered particularly intensive shelling. Houses and municipal buildings have been damaged. Seven people with bullet wounds have been admitted to a hospital. The Ossetian self-defense detachments fired in response to suppress the firing positions of the militants.

According to the press center of the information committee of South Ossetia, the Ossetian population has left almost all the villages of Tskhinvalskiy and Znaurskiy Rayons. Punitive actions by the militants continue here. They take as hostages local inhabitants, seize personal property, and rustle cattle. So far the fate of 15 Ossetians who were taken away by the militants is not known. In return, the Ossetian side has taken hostage 15 Georgians in Znaurskiy Rayon.

In addition South Ossetia has been economically isolated through a rigid transport blockade. All the main roads, by which humanitarian aid is arriving from Vladikavkaz, are under the control of armed detachments.

A mass meeting of inhabitants of the oblast center was held in Tskhinvali. Its participants demanded that President Zviad Gamsakhurdia release Torez Kolumbekov, former chairman of the South Ossetian Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, whom "International Amnesty," the human rights organization in London, called prisoner of

conscience number one. The text of an appeal to the leadership of the country, in which the inhabitants of South Ossetia demand the immediate introduction of a state of emergency throughout the territory of the autonomous oblast, was approved at the mass meeting.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Situation

OW0111164791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1524 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On October 31 the Georgian Supreme Soviet discussed the situation in South Ossetia.

The republican President Zviad Gamsakhurdia said that tension had been mounting in the region. According to the president, "this has been playing into the hands of certain forces." He mentioned that the normalisation of situation in the region is closely linked with relations between Russia and the USSR and Georgia. According to the president, the conflict in South Ossetia "may be suspended if Russia and the USSR recognize Georgia's independence."

The parliament overruled the motion by the Charter-91, an opposition faction on the immediate resumption of work of the joint—Soviet, Russian, Georgian—parliamentary commission engaged in a search for ways to normalise the situation in South Ossetia.

The Georgian Supreme Soviet decided to ask the UN to send international experts to Georgia to get an unbiassed appraisal of the situation in South Ossetia.

TASS Roundup of Area

LD0111192691 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz November 1 TASS—The armed conflict in South Ossetia continues to expand and escalate daily as Georgian militants use big-caliber machine guns, grenade launchers, anti-aircraft and hail-fighting guns to strafe Tskhinvali, the district centre of Znauri and even separate Ossetian villages.

According to the press centre of the South Ossetian Information Committee, armed militants continue driving civilians out of their homes in remote villages. They take hostages, seize individually-owned vehicles, property and farm produce and steal cattle.

Plenty of snow fell in the Caucasian mountains last night, which further complicated the delivery of food, medicine and fuel to besieged Tskhinvali. All roads leading to the regional centre have been blocked by militants.

As militants have stepped up attacks on troop emplacements and hostage taking from among servicemen, troop unit commanders have appealed to the Soviet defence minister and the commander of the Transcaucasian Military District, assuring them that the military will not be drawn into the armed conflict in South Ossetia but urging the supreme commandment and the country's leadership to take measures to ward off the danger to the lives of troops, their families and all civilians.

Refugees continue to arrive in North Ossetia from South Ossetia and other parts of Georgia. More than 85,000 refugees have amassed in Vladikavkaz and its suburbs. According to the North Ossetian Interior Ministry their number can reach 100,000 by the end of the year.

'Intense Firing' Reported

LD0211123991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 31 Oct 91

[text] The situation remains critical in South Ossetia. Despite the Illegal Formations Disarmament Week declared by the Georgian Government, each day brings fresh victims. Last night, according to the press center of the autonomous oblast's news committee, the southern and northern outskirts of Tskhinvali and the village of Prisi came under intense firing. The fire came from Georgian villages located outside the emergency zone.

Around Tskhinvali, the ring of the economic and food blockade is being tightened, a TASS correspondent reports. Humanitarian aid is coming from Vladikavkaz only via the main Dzhava-Tskhinvali road, under strengthened guard of the military and armored vehicles. South Ossetia's population continues to ask the country's leadership for immediate introduction of the emergency throughout the autonomous oblast's territory, and urgent evacuation of women, children, the elderly, and wounded from the areas of armed conflict.

Speaking in Tskhinvali to journalists, South Ossetian Oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] Chairman Znaur Gasiyev said the situation in the autonomous oblast was catastrophic. About 100,000 Ossetians had now left South Ossetia and the internal districts of Georgia. Either the Ossetian people will gain their right to self-determination as part of the Russian Federation or only self-defense detachments would be left in besieged Tskhinvali, who would die defending their native land.

Tskhinvali Guard 'Ready To Die'

LD0411095491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 4 Nov 91

[Text] The situation in the autonomous republic of South Ossetia, which is part of Georgia, has reached a critical point with the administrative center at Tskhinvali and other populated areas coming under intensive fire from Georgian militants over the past few days. According to the chairman of the regional council, Gasiyev, about 100,000 Ossetians have already fled the republic. He said the Ossetian people must realize the

right to self-determination within the Russian Federation, adding that soldiers of the self-defense guard in besieged Tskhinvali were ready to die for their native land.

President Gamsakhurdia Appoints New Officials

Advisor on Humanitarian, Legal Issues

AU0111154791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 24 Oct 91 p 1

["Decree by the President of the Republic of Georgia on the Appointment of S.M. Dzhorbenadze as Advisor to the President of the Republic of Georgia" issued in Tbilisi on 23 October]

[Text] To appoint Sergey Manaseyevich Dzhorbenadze as advisor to the president of the Republic of Georgia on humanitarian and legal questions.

[Signed] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia

[Date] Tbilisi, 23 October 1991.

Agriculture Minister

AU0111154591 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 1

["Decree by the President of the Republic of Georgia on the Appointment of N.A. Chitanava as Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, and the Food Industry of the Republic of Georgia" issued in Tbilisi on 19 October]

[Text] To appoint Nodar Ambroseyevich Chitanava as minister of agriculture, forestry, and the food industry of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia

[Date] Tbilisi, 19 October 1991.

Gamsakhurdia's Relations With Yeltsin Viewed

PM0111145291 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Nov 91 First Edition p 2

[Report from TASS and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondents column: "Georgian President's Press Conference"]

[Text] Zviad Gamsakhurdia has "thrown down the gauntlet" to Yegor Yakovlev. At a meeting with journalists the day before yesterday, a TASS correspondent reports, the Georgian president declared his willingness to take part in the "Who's Who" program, but is sure that the All-Union Television and Radio Company leadership will not agree to it. "Imperial forces are spreading disinformation about Georgia," Gamsakhurdia said. "An information war is being waged against us."

Gamsakhurdia described relations with Russian President Boris Yeltsin as "good, but rather uncertain at present, because the Russian Federation's position on the question of the so-called South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast is not entirely clear."

Supreme Soviet Grants Privileges to President

LD0311063191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 2 Nov 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of Georgia has determined the state material maintenance and services to the president of the republic. It has been determined that he will be allocated a monthly salary of 4,000 rubles, an official apartment in Tbilisi, two dachas, a specially equipped airplane and helicopter, armored motor transport, and guards.

On retirement, the president is to be allocated a pension of 2,400 rubles for life and is to be given a dacha with the necessary service, guards, and transport provision.

Supreme Soviet Rejects Economic Treaty

LD0211175191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Text] Georgia will not sign the Economic Treaty with the former Soviet republics. This was stated at the session of the parliament of this Transcaucasian republic which is under way in Tbilisi . In the opinion of parliamentarians this document does not take into consideration the fact that Georgia seeks to attain real independence and join the world community. In contrast to the parliament, the position of the Georgian Government was less categorical. It examines possibilities of associate membership in the economic community and bilateral ties with the former USSR members.

Kazakhstan

Further Reportage of Nazarbayev Visit to UK

Continues Business Meetings

LD0211231391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1453 GMT 1 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Levchenko]

[Text] London, 1 Nov (TASS)—Today, on the last day of an official visit to Great Britain, the president of Kazakhstan continued business meetings. Talks with Richard Titley, chairman of the "Sedgwick Group" insurance company; Sir Brian Corby, president of the Confederation of British Industry; and Tiny Rowland, chairman of the "Lonrho" mining company, were held. Also a meeting with John Wakeham, secretary of state for energy; John Mitchell, chairman of the East European Department of ICI Chemical Corporation; and Howard Dalton, managing director of "British Gas," took place.

During all meetings prospects for attracting British business to the development of republic's economy and to the implementation of planned far-reaching reforms there were discussed. The president said that Jacques Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which will provide help in elaborating plans for future broadening of contacts with foreign business and financial circles, will arrive in Kazakhstan on 2 December.

In an interview with REUTER Nursultan Nazarbayev stressed that he will take all possible measures to prevent a wild outburst of "medieval nationalism" in the republic. "My policy as well as the policy of the whole present leadership in Kazakhstan is not directed at turning the country back to the times of medieval nationalism," he said. "We want to create a modern civilized state in which human rights would be respected. We do not regard those many Russians who live in Kazakhstan as aliens or immigrants. They are Kazakh citizens. I will do all I can to prevent border wars or clashes between representatives of different nationalities or peoples."

Goals 'Successfully' Attained

LD0211225791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1940 GMT 31 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Voskoboynikov]

[Text] London, 31 Oct (TASS)— "The goals of the visit have been successfully attained." This is what Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev, who is in this country at an official invitation of the British Government, said at a briefing held at the Foreign Press Association headquarters today. Today is the penultimate day of the Kazakh president's visit. As of the preceding days, it was a very full day: He had talks with Chancellor Norman Lamont, was present at the official ceremony opening a session of the British parliament, and held intensive talks with representatives of the biggest companies—British Gas, British Petroleum; it is impossible to list everything. The great interest shown in Nazarbayev's news conference by representatives of foreign media is all the more understandable for that.

According to the president, accords in three specific areas were reached at the talks with Prime Minister John Major and at today's meeting with Lamont. In the first place, the British Government promised "special support" for Kazakhstan, rendering technical assistance in the course of implementing the privatization programs both in providing expert advice and in training Kazakh specialists directly in British companies and financial institutes. Second, the question of involving major banks to carry out an independent international expert study of the largest projects in Kazakhstan, which has abundant natural resources, was discussed. Third, assistance for commercial banks that wish to do business in Kazakhstan was discussed. "I secured full support," stressed N. Nazarbayev, who added: "I have not come to ask for handouts or some special benefits for Kazakhstan; I have come so that big British business can join in the development of our republic on mutually advantageous terms."

Not for the first time journalists asked the president about the nuclear weapons situated on the territory of the republic. In reply they heard yet again: "There is no need to fear the weapons situated in Kazakhstan. These nuclear missiles will remain in place and will not be redeployed anywhere else." As transpires from the Economic Treaty signed by the republics, said N. Nazarbayev, there will be unified control over strategic nuclear missiles in the single economic space which is being established. At the same time, he noted: "Kazakhstan does not want to become a hostage to any other republic or any other center, and Kazakhstan's defense minister should take part in working out military doctrine and deal with questions connected with strategic missiles." Touching on the position of the Ukraine regarding nuclear arms, the president emphasized that the Ukrainian position is "understandable." "It has been engendered by, to put it mildly, not very responsible statements of some politicians in Russia," he said, noting that as far as he knows, B.N. Yeltsin does not support such statements. "I know that Kravchuk's view is that strategic weapons ought to be controlled from one center," stated the president of Kazakhstan.

As was to be expected, a considerable number of questions put to N. Nazarbayev was devoted to the prospects of the development of the situation in the USSR. "The main threat to our democracy, to the process which is currently under way in the Soviet Union, and exerts a positive influence upon the whole climate in the world, is not so much the separatism of the republics and their mutual relations, as the hunger, the bread famine in the Soviet Union, he said. I assure you that I know the situation very well and am telling you this in full awareness of the importance of what I have just said. There is,

as I have noticed, a view in the West that the Soviet Union will suffer a bit more, will survive somehow and that there will be no hunger there. As for me, I am bound to state that hunger will come to many regions of the Soviet Union already by the new year, and if assistance is not rendered in time, the people will be ready to accept any dictatorship." According to N. Nazarbayev, in order to help the Soviet republics, the Western powers must allow our country to defer payments on both long-term and short-term credits and also make credits available to it to buy food in other countries. Moreover it must be done very quickly.

"My view is that republics must extricate themselves from the crisis together," stressed the president of Kazakhstan. The ties among them are so deep, he noted, that both enterprises and the republics themselves suffer from their rupture. N. Nazarbayev resolutely supported the economic reform program recently set out in the Russian parliament by B.N. Yeltsin. He pointed out that the measures proposed by the president of Russia had been agreed upon. "I have recently talked about all this with Yeltsin and I fully support the ideas he voiced," said he. "We must make headway and not mark time, and someone must take the responsibility."

Speaking of Kazakhstan's foreign policy, N. Nazarbayev pointed out that "we are an Asian state and we focus special attention upon our Asian neighbors," although this should not in any way affect the relations of the republic with other countries. The president said that Iran and Saudi Arabia had invited him to pay visits there and that he intended to visit these countries without fail. According to Nazarbayev, he will not accept "the Islamic approach, to say nothing of Islamic fundamentalism" for his republic, but he is in favor of developing economic, cultural, and other ties with Muslim and, in particular, Arab countries.

Visit Ends; Results Reviewed

PM0411163591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Nov 91 Union Edition p 7

[A. Krivopalov report: "Main Topic—Business. The Visit to Great Britain by President N. Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan Has Ended"]

[Text] London—The five day visit to the United Kingdom by President N. Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan has ended. His meetings here were held on several levels, but no matter where the talks took place—be it in government offices, the parliament, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, bank or company offices, or production sites—everywhere business was the predominant theme.

I accompanied N. Nazarbayev on one of his trips around the country. The British Petroleum company had invited the president to visit the "Wytch Farm" oil deposit in Dorset. On the return journey I asked N. Nazarbayev to share his impressions from this trip and from his other meetings with British business representatives.

As is known, we are currently enlisting foreign companies to help in the development of the republic's rich oil and gas deposits, the president replied. Some of them are competing for contracts. They include British Petroleum, British Gas, ENI, and a number of other companies. Therefore it is very useful or us to see how they operate, and in particular how they ensure the ecological protection of the environment. The terms they are offering are also important, of course. For the time being, we are not giving anyone any priorities, that will be decided later.

[Krivopalov] You had a long talk with the British Prime Minister John Major. What did you discuss?

[Nazarbayev] I pursued a purely practical aim—involving British businessmen in work in Kazakhstan on mutually advantageous terms. It was therefore important for me to ensure that resources from the "know-how" fund, which has been set up here, are used also to render assistance to our republic.

I met the representatives of a number of banks which will discharge a mediating mission, help in the capacity of consultants, attract foreign capital to the republic, and provide expert assessments of the advantageousness of specific offers submitted by foreign companies. I have reached accords to this effect here. The headquarters of the Arab Al-Barakah Bank are located in London. It is planned to open a branch of this bank in Kazakhstan within the current year.

I also had talks with the leadership of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Its representatives will arrive in Alma-Ata in less than a month. [Nazarbayev ends]

The content of Nazarbayev's talk with the prime minister of Great Britain is reflected in their joint statement. It notes that Western assistance will produce long-term benefits only if it is accompanied by profound reforms in the Soviet Union including cuts in defense expenditure.

Major and President Nazarbayev, the document notes, expressed the hope that relations in various spheres will develop in the future, emphasized the importance of trade between Kazakhstan and Great Britain, and agreed to promote the activity of joint ventures.

Opposition Protests Against President 2 Nov

OW0211200391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1730 GMT 2 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] About 500 supporters of the National-Democratic Party ZHELTOKSAN and the Party of Kazakh National Independence ALASH have held a rally today, Nov 2, in the Kazakh capital Alma-Ata. This continues mass demonstrations in the run-up to the presidential election coming Dec 1.

Activists of some youth organisations accuse the incumbent Kazakh President of spiriting away lists with signatures in favour of an alternative candidate—the chairman of the ZHELTOKSAN party Hasen Kozhahmetov.

As we have reported, Oct 31, the last nominating day, the militia struck down two traditional Kazakh tents used as canvassing posts which contained lists with 40,000 signatures in favour of Hasen Kozhahmetov and 13,000 roubles of party funds. As this candidate's election agents were arrested, the lists and the money disappeared.

Speakers at the rally sharply criticized the economic policies of the Kazakh government, particularly the joint venture with the American CHEVRON company for developing the Tenguiz oil field.

The demonstrators carried posters saying, "Nazarbayev, return stolen electoral rolls" and "Nursultan, you will answer for Tenguiz".

Defense Chief Advocates Unified Armed Forces

PM0311144091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Nov 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with S. Nurmagambetov, chairman of the Kazakh State Committee for Defense, by correspondent Colonel A. Ladin—date, place not stated: "S. Nurmagambetov: 'Kazakhstan Continues To Advocate Unified Armed Forces'"]

[Text] As we have already reported, by decree of the president of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] a republic State Committee for Defense has been formed. The president has appointed Sagadat Kozhakhmetovich Nurmagambetov its chairman.

Our correspondent Colonel A. Ladin asked S. Nurmagambetov to describe the main avenues of activity of the republic State Committee for Defense.

[Nurmagambetov] The creation of the Kazakh SSR State Committee for Defense was stipulated in the republic's declaration of sovereignty. We decided against calling this body a ministry, because we think there is a single organ of control of the Armed Forces—the USSR Defense Ministry. Our republic's State Committee for Defense will not have its own troops.

The State Committee sees its most important objective in unifying the whole of the military infrastructure that exists in the republic. What I mean by that is the military commissariats, with their broad tasks in manning the forces, preparing reserves, and tackling mobilization questions, and also civil defense, which is currently separate from the republic's military commissariats. There must be complete clarity regarding the military faculties at higher educational establishments: Whom do they train? For which categories of troops? The military district is simply unable to oversee their work.

The military academies will come under our attention. The problem of appropriate, high-quality staffing of military educational establishments has long been pressing. As you know, Kazakhstan is a multinational republic. And we would like young men of different nationalities to be able to fulfill their dream of becoming officers. It is important, of course, that the entrants also include representatives of the Central Asian republics and people of the indigenous nationality, including Kazakhs. We would like more natives of Kazakhstan to serve on the republic's territory. We see no particular problem about this.

I would like to tell you briefly about the proposed structure of the Kazakh SSR State Committee for Defense. The staff will probably take on coordinating functions. I do not think we can do without an operations directorate or department, which would collate all the data about military activity on the republic's territory, so that the republic president has accurate and concrete information about the situation.

I would like the republic State Committee for Defense to have a highly professional staff. During my trip to Moscow I hope to come to an agreement with Army General V. Lobov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, about assigning to the State Committee a group of military specialists in various areas. We would like to have around 25 percent cadre officers.

In the course of its activity the Kazakh SSR State Committee for Defense will take every step to strengthen military discipline in the Army and Navy.

Kazakhstan has advocated and continues to advocate unified Armed Forces. We do not intend to create our own military units. We are linked to Russia by deep historical roots, and I hope we will remain together in the years to come.

Kazakh SSR President Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbayev firmly upholds the position regarding unified Armed Forces.

This way of organizing defense can rebuff any aggression. To disunite the Army and Navy is to weaken defenses. Who will take any notice of Armed Forces made up of small formations? Such forces are unlikely to be capable of offering any marked resistance, taking account of the nature of combat operations today. Having devoted all of my adult life to the Army, I know the value of unified Armed Forces that are well equipped and excellently trained.

Kyrgyzstan

President Akayev Reviews Visit to U.S.

LD0311111691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1711 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By TASS correspondent Zoya Ismatullina]

[Text] Bishkek, 2 Nov (TASS)—The visit of a state delegation of Kyrgyzstan to the United States helped shape an image of the republic as a democratic state, said Askar Akayev, president of the republic, at a news conference today. In accordance with the program of the visit, there were conversations with President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker, as well as meetings with other political leaders, Congress members, scholars, and cultural figures. The president of Kyrgyzstan spoke at the 46th session of the UN General Assembly, and at Columbia University.

According to Askar Akayev, the republic will receive help in the sphere of training specialists and the development of health protection. Real cooperation in agriculture with the state of Idaho, which specializes in agriculture, will be developed. The Americans will help Kyrgyzstan in creating processing industries, storage technology, transportation of goods, and training farmers.

President Reacts to 'Realistic' Yeltsin Program

LD0311113191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1914 GMT 2 Nov 91

[By KIRTAG correspondent Zuleykha Ismatullina]

[Text] Bishkek, 2 Nov (TASS)—Kyrgyzstan's President Askar Akayev has described the program launched by Russian President Boris Yeltsin at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies as "realistic and very powerful." This is by far the most impressive of all the programs of recent years, Akayev said in answering the TASS correspondent's question at a news conference which took place here today. Yeltsin's program is in many respects in keeping with what is being done in Kyrgyzstan, which is pursuing "a course toward the large-scale development of enterprise, private property, and land reform."

The only point in the Russian program arousing doubt is the liberalization of prices, the president noted. "I do not believe that given the shortage of goods it will improve the economy. On the contrary, our diseases, such as speculation, will get even worse." If Russia liberates prices, this will also affect Kyrgyzstan, and therefore cannot fail to worry us, Akayev said. The difficulty could be resolved by means of foreign credits. According to calculations made by economists, the country will need goods worth 12-15 billion dollars in order to start improving the economy. This would help extract from money-boxes and stockings no fewer than 500 billion rubles, and put them into circulation.

Western credits can be taken in goods, Kyrgyzstan's president believes. He rejected the view that the question of national currencies raised by the republics is a manifestation of separatism. Today the ruble has ceased to have any weight, is in fact not functioning and "is destabilizing the financial system of the republics." If one were to succeed in strengthening it, the problem of national currency would disappear, Akayev stressed.

To Meet Yeltsin 5 Nov

LD0311141591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 3 Nov 91

[Excerpts] Kyrgyzstan's President Askar Akayev stated in Bishkek that he supports the program of Russia's President Boris Yeltsin, and expressed confidence that it is realistic and feasible. [passage omitted]

Kyrgyzstan's president announced that on 5 November his meeting with Boris Yeltsin will take place in Moscow, during the course of which it is intended to discuss questions of economic cooperation between Russia and Kyrgyzstan, as on the whole the economic reform goals in the republics coincide.

One of the possible items on the agenda is the question of currency. If Russia introduces a three-striped or tricolor ruble, Akayev said, then it is perfectly possible that Kyrgyzstan will recognize the new Russian currency, and will use it on its territory.

Uzbekistan

People's Democratic Party Holds Congress 1 Nov

OW0111141191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1145 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On November 1, the People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan, the successor of the republic's communist party, held its constituent congress in Tashkent.

Speaking at the congress, President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov said that the new party would work for the attainment of civil peace, ethnic accord and law and order in all spheres of life. He said that among the new party's priority tasks was Uzbekistan's real state independence and the assertion of its status of a full-fledged member of the world community.

Mr. Karimov said that the new party was campaigning for a free confederation of sovereign states—the subjects of the former union—and for creating a uniform economic system. He also spoke in support of the economic-community treaty signed in Moscow. At the same time Mr. Karimov emphasized the need to deal with the crisis using one's own resources. He said that Uzbekistan had much to offer the internal and world markets. In terms of world prices, the worth of precious and non-ferrous metals, annually produced in the republic, stood at 1.3 billion dollars, he said. This, in his opinion, was a serious capital which could help Uzbekistan create a well-developed industry.

Mr. Karimov said that the People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan was guided by the universal ideals of justice, equality and freedom, and that it condemned totalitarianism which it did not at all associate with the Russian people. He said that the new party favoured a dialogue with religious organizations in moral and humane

aspects, charity, peaceableness and revival of spiritual and cultural traditions. He criticized calls for creating political religious organizations and for giving religion a state status. At the same time, he said that membership in the party would not infringe on the citizens' rights, including freedom of conscience, or their right to be a believer.

IF's [INTERFAX] Tashkent correspondent reports that on Friday, the party intended to adopt its programme and rules, and elect its chairman, central council and central auditing commission.

Bolshevism, Communism 'Abandoned'

LD0311091991 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Video report by correspondent M. Ganiyev in Tashkent; from the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] The Communist Party of Uzbekistan, which ruled in the past, no longer exists. It has been replaced by the new People's Democratic Party. There are over 350,000 members in the ranks of the People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan. Of these 300,000 are former Communists.

Today the delegates of the constituent congress of the new party have been discussing its program and its statute. A month ago, their drafts were published in the press of the republic. The congress will end with the elections to the central bodies to the People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan.

In the morning Islam Karimov, chairman of the organizational committee of the constituent congress, member of the new party, and president of Uzbekistan, delivered a report: "The Role and the Place of the People's Democratic Party in the Creation of Worthy Conditions for the People." The People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan has fully abandoned bolshevism and communism. Its supreme goal is outlined in the title of the report. On a broader scale, the People's Democratic Party is in favor of humanism, democracy, and the defense of people's rights and interests. The party offers to join the efforts to create a society which guarantees that every person, irrespective of his nationality and religion, has a free choice in his political, economic, and social being.

The People's Democratic Party is a parliamentary party, and its elected member will be running for the post of head of the Republic. If elected president, he will remain the leader of the party. The congress is being held in an atmosphere of unanimity and mutual understanding.

Karimov Elected Head of Party

OW0111225691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1748 GMT 1 Nov 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Uzbek President Islam Karimow was elected chairman of the People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan. It is the successor of the republican Communist Party that was also headed by Karimow.

The Friday session of the constituent congress elected the Central Council and the Central Auditing Commission of the party and passed its programme and charter. Under these documents the party chairman is its official candidate for the Uzbek presidency.

Today the party has a membership of 320,000, most of whom are former communists.

Defense Ministry Favors Unified Armed Forces

LD0311145891 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 2 Nov 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] A new decision has been adopted in Uzbekistan: On the routine callup of citizens for active military service. Our correspondent interviewed Rustam Akhmedov, minister for the affairs of defense of the Republic of Uzbekistan and commander of the National Guard.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified woman correspondent] Rustam Urmanovich, it is known that Uzbekistan is one of those sovereign republics which supports the idea of preserving a single defense system and integral Armed Forces. A new decision on the 1991 callup was published in the republican press today. What are the main features of this fall callup?

[Akhmedov] We supported and are supporting the unity of the country's Armed Forces and collective defense. Today the Armed Forces are the last connecting link in a collapsing Union. Splitting them among republics will lead to a catastrophe. As you remember, an unprecedented accord has been signed between the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Ministry of Defense, and on its basis a decision by the Cabinet of Ministers has been adopted.

I will cite for you some fundamentally new conditions of the callup. A list of districts has been determined where our lads will serve. It includes the Western Group of Forces, the Northern Group of Forces, the Volga-Urals Military District, and the Far Eastern Military District. All military construction workers will serve only on the republic's territory. Those exempt from callup are the only son, even if he has sisters capable of working, the younger son if his older brothers are serving or have served, or shepherds during the working period. It is not permitted that two or more brothers from one family serve in the Army. If a member of a family should die while in service, all brothers become exempt.

I must note that this concerns all nationalities, all the citizens of the republic residing in the Republic of Uzbekistan. I believe that today we—all nationalities, all

ethnic groups—must do everything possible in order to preserve integral Armed Forces. [end recording]

Republic Not To Help Pay Soviet Foreign Debt

LD0211183691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 30 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast presented by Rabiga Amanzholova]

[Text] In our "TV Inform" program yesterday evening, we carried a report received from TASS on the results of the meeting held by representatives of the sovereign republics and heads of government with leaders of the financial bodies of the G-7.

That report contained a number of fundamental distortions, the plenipotentiary mission of the Republic of Uzbekistan in Moscow believes. In the opinion of the mission, the problem of foreign debt must be considered in the context of all the highly important political and economic issues affecting the USSR, and not tackled on its own, especially not in isolation from the matter of the repayment of other countries' debts to the USSR. The parties responsible for the debt are the USSR and those who conducted foreign policy and foreign economic activity on its behalf, often not in the interests of the republics, including Uzbekistan.

This republic, half of whose population are children under the age of 16, has a standard of living that is one of the worst in the country. Consumption of basic foodstuffs, incomes, and consumer goods are practically a half less [not further specified]. The amount of capital investment for production and social purposes per head of population in the last 20 years has been almost half the Union average. At the same time, the republic has been the country's leading hard currency earner for over 25 years already, supplying the Union treasury with tens of tons of top quality gold each year.

All this, taking into account the economic, social, and historical aspects, makes it impossible for Uzbekistan to participate in the payment of the USSR's foreign debt. Besides, the leadership of the Republic of Uzbekistan believes that Union bodies should provide full information about the purposes for which the resources received have been used and about the current state of the Union's assets.

Regarding loans that are being taken out at present, the republic bears full responsibility for them, the statement by the plenipotentiary mission of the Republic of Uzbekistan in Moscow says.

Cypriot President Visits; Economic Ties Viewed

LD0211192291 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 30 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast presented by Amanzholova]

[Text] Continuing his working visit to our country, the president of Cyprus visited Uzbekistan. Our correspondent [Sh. Ganiyeva] reports from Tashkent.

[Ganiyeva] Today in Tashkent head of the Republic of Cyprus Yeoryios Vasiliou and his entourage met with Uzbekistan's President Karimov, who, in a detailed conversation acquainted the guest with the sociopolitical situation in the republic, which has proclaimed its independence. At the same time Uzbekistan's president expressed his readiness to continue developing interstate economic ties and told of the difficulties of the transition to market relations.

In turn, the president of Cyprus expressed satisfaction with his trip to Uzbekistan, where his father had lived and worked for many years. The conversation also touched on the complex problems of the Cyprus problem. Afterwards Yeoryios Vasiliou expressed his conviction that relations between the Republics of Cyprus and Uzbekistan will not only be goodneighborly, but also in the long-term mutually advantageous on the basis of trade and economic cooperation. [Video shows Vasiliou-Karimov talks in large hall, both delegations seated opposite one another]

[Begin recording] [Ganiyeva] How do you see the further development of relations, of direct bilateral relations between Cyprus and Uzbekistan?

[Vasiliou, in English with superimposed Russian translation] Your republic possesses immense real wealth and we are glad of the opportunity to cooperate directly. Today we discussed how our official business contacts will be implemented in the future and we hope that they will be fruitful. [end recording]